BACONIANA

VOL. XLI (72nd Year) No. 157 NOVEMBER, 1957

It should be clearly understood that BACONIANA *is a medium for the discussion of subjects connected with the Objects of the Society, but the Council does not necessarily endorse opinions expressed by contributors or correspondents.*

EDITORIAL

"The gardens of Love wherein he now playeth himself, are fresh to-day and fading tomorrow, as the sun comforts or is turned from them. But the Gardens of the Muses keep the privilege of the golden age; they ever flourish and are in league with Time....."

(FRANCIS BACON)

We cannot leave the younger days of Francis Bacon to proceed with our re-examination of his public life, without saying a word upon a lighter subject, his life-long interest in the theatre. The quotation above is from one of his earlier dramatic efforts, a Masque or Device written for the Earl of Essex and to be performed before Queen Elizabeth I. In form it is poetical, impassioned and contains the seeds of an imagination which was to blossom fully in years to come and culminate in the richness and splendour of the *New Atlantis*. The fertile imagination, which in later life, could conceive the State of Bensalem, most colourful of all Utopias, had also its youthful period. Nor were these writings his only efforts in the realm of fiction.

The authorship of the masque called "The Prince of Purpoole" is assigned by Spedding to Francis Bacon in no uncertain terms....

> "....that the speeches of the Six Councillors were written by him, and by him alone, no one who is at all familiar with his style of thought or expression will for a moment doubt. They carry his signature in every sentence. And they have a much deeper interest for us..... All these Councillors speak with Bacon's tongue and out of Bacon's brain; but the second and fifth speak out of his heart and judgment also.....an enumeration of those very reforms in State and Government which throughout his life he was most anxious to see realised.....a first hint of his great project.....a first draft of 'Solomon's House'."

How is it then that the Benchers of Gray's Inn, could not bring themselves to give more credit where it was due, when the Gesta Grayorum of 1594 were reproduced last November in the presence of

Her Majesty the Queen? It is true that Bacon appears in the introductory part as one of the important figures who were present in 1594. He is even hailed as "Sir Francis"—an honour which strictly speaking was not granted to him until the following reign. But the significant fact that he was actually called in on the 29th December, 1594 "to assist in recovering the lost honour of Gray's Inn" in a series of theatrical entertainments which had apparently gone astray, and that he must clearly have been regarded by the Benchers as an expert in these matters, seems to have been overlooked.

In reviving the Revels of 1594 there can be no doubt that Gray's Inn did full justice to the occasion. The whole performance was in excellent taste and (as has been truly said in the Editorial column of "Graya") those who were fortunate enough to be present will remember the day, and the scintillating visit of Her Majesty as long as they live. And if the organisers did not feel themselves called upon to pay some tribute to Francis Bacon, at least they refrained from the suggestion that Will Shakspere wrote the masque called "The Prince of Purpoole" ! So it remains for us as the custodians of a great man's name and reputation to remind our readers that Francis Bacon's taste for theatricals is proved beyond all doubt.

* * * *

In the world of familiar historical illustration there are still two Francis Bacons. The man whom Raleigh admired, whom Ben Jonson reverenced above all his contemporaries, and who was beloved and trusted where ever personally known (as in Gray's Inn and in the House of Commons)—this surely was not the Bacon of Macaulay, Dean Church and Lytton Strachey. The intriguing caricature of a mighty intellect, false friend and corrupt judge—so vividly and so shamelessly sketched by Macaulay—has not yet faded out. It is a fascinating image for those who prefer fiction to fact, but the ground below it is heavily mined. "My name I leave to foreign nations and the next ages"—this is the extraordinary cry for justice, still to be fulfilled, in the opening sentence of his Will.

Macaulay, however, was artist enough to recognise the visionary qualities of Bacon's mind better than most. He did not, as did Shelley, regard Bacon as one of the great poets of the Ages, but he shows us in a very stimulating passage how the beauty and poetic imagery of Bacon's *Essays* increased rather than decreased as the years went by.

What may have seemed an unusual phenomenon to Macaulay is no longer to be wondered at if Bacon, in early life, used another outlet than the *Essays* for his "raging fancy" (as his chaplain was later to call it)—an outlet suggested by the early masques and ceremonies at Gray's Inn.

We have sometimes heard it urged in debate by Shakespearian scholars who do not trouble to read Bacon, that the latter was not at all interested in the theatre and was probably quite oblivious of the Shakespeare Plays which were appearing from time to time in print during his life. This certainty is to betray great ignorance. Bacon, in his remarks on the theatre shows intense interest in the use and

abuse of stage plays, both ancient and contemporary. The subject is fully discussed in Book VI of the *De Augmentis*, but in many of his other writings he cannot help bringing in the words "theatre and "stage" almost unconsciously....

> "But it is not good to stay too long in the *theatre*. Let us now pass to the judicial place or palace of the mind."
>
> (*Advancement of Learning*). (Ibid.)

If we follow Bacon's interest in theatricals from the early days at Gray's Inn, through the constant reference to teaching by "lively representation" or by true "types" and "examples" to the final dissertation in the *De Augmentis*, we can only regard his complete silence regarding the Shake-speare plays, or the celebrated actor of the Globe Theatre, as presenting a curious literary problem. That he was equally reticent about Marlowe, who followed him at Cambridge, and about the other Elizabethan dramatists, does not solve the problem. His intense interest in the subject of "dramatic poesy" being clearly established and proved in his own acknowledged writings, what was the object of this reticence?

It seems that Bacon's peculiar interest in masques, plays, revels, etc., though amply confirmed, does not fit in with the false historical portrait of him, and also lends unwelcome support to the idea of his having been a "concealed poet" (if we may use the epithet which he used of himself in a letter to Sir John Davies). This idea therefore is usually brushed aside or ignored in tactful deference to the vested interests of the Shakespeare Trust.

We would in no way minimise the good work which is being done in the now prosperous borough of Stratford-on-Avon by the excellent performances of the Shakespeare Plays. Why, good gracious, if in swallowing the medicine of Jaques "to cleanse the foul body of the infected world" the audience is still content to swallow the bottle and the label too, it is no more than the real author must have expected. But box-office receipts and history are two different things. If Bacon really had a life-long interest in the Stage, it does not strengthen the orthodox case to soft-pedal it. The fact must be faced that this pre-occupation could hardly have failed to bring him into contact with Will Shakspere, who was living in London at the same time. The *Comedy of Errors* was "played by the players" at the Gray's Inn Revels of 1594, and so it has been a quite reasonable conjecture to connect Shakspere with the production of the various masques. But this can only be conjecture, whereas Bacon's own connection with them is established.

* * * *

A charming article by Mr. W. G. C. Gundry of the Middle Temple entitled "Some Vanity of Mine Art", relieves us from describing in greater detail how the Gray's Inn Revels of 1594 were reproduced last autumn in the presence of the Queen. Between the lines, our readers

may discern Mr. Gundry's own disappointment that some better tribute could not have been paid to one of the Inn's greatest Benchers, who rose from Lenten Reader to Lord Chancellor. The speeches of the six Councillors are so utterly Baconian in character that even James Spedding (who could never bring himself seriously to consider. the Shakesperian problem) unhesitatingly proclaimed their origin, Yet so strong are the vested interests of Shakespearian orthodoxy, that they seem able to hypnotise and "warn off" students of history when there is any serious suggestion of Bacon's connection with the theatre, or even that of his brother Anthony. Their mother the Lady Anne, saw fit to reprimand this low taste in her sons in words which give us a very fair idea of her views and theirs. From her letter of December 5th, 1594, to Anthony (from which Mr. Gundry quotes) it appears that the youth of Gray's Inn, including her two sons, were gravely suspected of "sinfully revelling". Indeed there can be little doubt of it! But what began as "mumming and masking "at Gray's Inn, or perhaps even earlier, was destined to influence indirectly almost everything that Bacon wrote. Even in a scientific treatise the whole earth seems to have appeared to him as a "theatre", and the life of man as a performance. How like the philosophy of Jaques!

When it comes to defining the "idols" which beset the human mind, is it not a strange coincidence that in the *Novum Organum* the name chosen for the last great class of idols should be the "Idola Teatri"? Roger Bacon, three centuries earlier, had only enumerated the other three, and the last and fourth was a contribution from the brain of Francis alone.....

> "These we call Idols of the Theatre, for we account all invented systems of philosophy as so many stage-plays, representing scenic and fictitious worlds.....Nor in this do we comprehend only the universal philosophies, but all principles and axioms of Knowledge which have thrived on tradition, credulity and negligence....."
>
> (*Novum Organum.* Book I, p. 44)

Tradition and credulity! Would it really have been beyond the ingenuity of Francis to have contrived a monstrous "idol" of the Theatre, in a form which must one day collapse and inevitably fall to the ground? If so, there could be no better demonstration of his axiom "Men believe what they prefer"; and the prophecy in his will may yet be fulfilled!

But, reversing his directive, let us turn back from the palace or judicial seat of the mind to the Theatre. We have come to believe that his interest in the stage was not only philosophical and that he actually enjoyed theatricals, masques, and ceremonies, for their own sake and for the merriment and glamour with which they could adorn every day life. The quotation which precedes this column is taken from a dramatic piece spoken in character. Some would say it is in the Shakespearian manner, and some would say not. The very question is

idle, for genius is master of many styles. What concerns us most in these lines is the heartfelt and impassioned plea for poetry itself.

Judged by the graver standards of statesmanship and philosophy, these theatricals, these "vanities of mine art" might appear as a weakness in Bacon. They would not, for example, have appealed to his uncle, Lord Burleigh, though they do seem to have amused Queen Bess. There are evidences of a sparkling wit in Bacon, however carefully restrained. Ben Jonson bears witness that the great philosopher could never refrain from a joke. Yet it seems that Bacon in spite of a taste for buffoonery and what we should now call the "footlight glamour", was never beglamoured to the point of surrendering his judgment. To love poetry while calling it "feigned history", to see it as the only true relic of the golden age and at the same time as "vinum demonum", is to see at once in many dimensions.

The quaint essay *Of Masques and Triumphs* was among the last group of essays to be published. Who but an experienced lover of the stage could possibly have written it?

> "It is true the alterations of scenes, so it be quietly and without noise, are things of great beauty. For they feed and relieve the eye, before it be full of the same object".

Alternately to "feed and relieve the eye," if we may digress for a moment, is one of the delights of Japanese stage-craft and scene shifting, which is almost magical in its effects. It was probably in the later years, long after those days of "mumming and masking" at Grays Inn, that this supreme balance was attained. The essay on Truth, which first appeared when Bacon was 65 years of age also contains its brilliant effects, its crystal-clear imagery.....

> "Truth may perhaps come to the price of a pearl, that sheweth best by day. But it will not rise to the price of a Diamond or Carbuncle that sheweth best in varied lights. A mixture of a lie doth ever add pleasure. "

Here truth is set above all things—in the enquiry, in the knowledge, and in the belief or enjoyment of it—as "the sovereign good of human nature". But the price, which after all is the market value of it—that is set below the price of falsehood, even as the price of a pearl is set below that of a diamond.

On the title page of the *New Atlantis* there appeared in the first edition a curious engraving of an old man with a scythe leading a naked damsel from the mouth of a dark and forbidding cavern....Time disclosing Truth. May we express the hope that, if ever the prophecy in Bacon's will becomes fulfilled, and his "name" becomes known to his own countrymen "after some time be past", this truth may at last be recognised as a pearl of great price, although by our "candle-lights" its virtue may seem to have been lost in a setting of many diamonds.

* * * *

Mr. Eagle has been busy on the Society's behalf again. Having reached the final, fatal question on the "64,000 Question" programme in I.T.V. last autumn, he was recently invited to take part in the new

"64,000 dollar challenge" with Mr. Vernon Gosling as champion and himself as challenger. Both failed on the same part of the "16,000" question, so honours were divided. The actual question was, "Who are the two characters present outside Shylock's house when Jessica elopes?" Both correctly gave Gratiano for one, but failed to identify the second. The name given on the card was Salarino, which we find confirmed in our own Shakespeare. But the question is a confusing one, because among the *dramatis personæ* of *The Merchant of Venice* are three minor characters—Salanio, Salerio and Salarino, the last being Salino in the folio of 1623, and Salaryno in the quarto of 1600. And in the 1951 edition of Shakespeare (edited by Peter Alexander and published by Collins), Salarino is not included in the *dramatis personæ* at all and his lines are given to Salerio. The question obviously stumped the contestants, who cheerfully gave it up; but we think they might both be pardoned for their confusion, and perhaps the question-compiler ought to be congratulated!

What impressed us most was the friendliness with which the programme was conducted, and which no doubt encouraged Mr. Eagle to take the opportunity of making a confession of his Baconianism, an announcement which seemed to give pleasure rather than offence to those present. Anyone whose knowledge of Shakespeare is profound enough to carry him to the forefront of this difficult programme on two successive occasions, and has the courage to own up to his Baconian convictions in public (and get away with it), is to be heartily congratulated.

When the ordeal was over and the champion, challenger and Robin Bailey gathered for a moment in front of those two imposing boxes to exchange a friendly farewell, Mr. Eagle's long memory rose to the occasion, and he vastly pleased the audience with an apt quotation from the epilogue of *A Midsummer Night's Dream.*

> "So goodnight unto you all.
> Give me your hand, if we be friends,
> And Robin shall restore amends."

* * * *

In our Correspondence we print two letters published in the *Daily Telegraph* dated 24th May last, including one from Mr. Eagle quoting Hamlet's comment on the election of Claudius as King of Denmark. Mr. Eagle may well ask how Shaksper could have known of the elective system obtaining in that country and it seems that no explanation by the "Shakespearian authorities" has yet been forthcoming. Francis Bacon, however, as an eminent lawyer and courtier, was more than likely to have been interested in this question.

* * *

In his *Shakespeare's Sources* (Methuen 25/-) Professor Kenneth Muir has studied in a comprehensive manner the verdict of modern scholars on the innumerable sources of the playwright's materials for his comedies and tragedies. The result, as described by Professor Wilson Knight in a review in the *Yorkshire Post*, is "impressive". We

might even call it miraculous! Professor Muir, now in the Chair of English Literature at Liverpool, "shows that Shakespeare tended (*sic*) to consult all available material.....and *it looks as though he did not confine himself to English*: the dramatist appears to have been a man of wider reading and more laboured care than used to be supposed."

It has now been suggested in all seriousness by different writers that Will Shakspere must have been a schoolmaster, a lawyer's clerk versed in conveyancing, and a language student! His range of experience gets larger and larger, and the supposed library at New Place more and more extensive. Yet not a single book or play was mentioned in his will, and no evidence is available to controvert the assumption that his parents and his children were illiterate. Not a manuscript nor even a private letter from him is known to have survived, and the six different signatures are so inconsistent that they have been explained as being a "guided Hand" or the result of "alcoholism".

How long will orthodox scholarship continue to evade the issue and refuse even to consider the bare possibility that he may not have written the Plays? It is difficult to see how the erstwhile butcher's apprentice could have assimilated the stupendous culture displayed in the plays without leaving any record of school or university education. Professor Kenneth Muir's book and his impressive list of supposed material "sources" certainly demonstrates one thing —that the literary world of to-day is less inclined to speak so glibly of "untutored carefree genius". Orthodoxy is beginning to recognise the obvious possibility that the plays were the product of a polished mind, nurtured in influential circumstances and steeped in the classical learning which in those days was only available in universities, the Church, and aristocratic families. It has been shown beyond all possibility of doubt that, prior to 1594, Francis Bacon was studying the literature of France, Spain and Italy. His private notebook of that date, The Promus of Formularies and Elegancies (now in the British Museum) bears the evidence of this in his own hand-writing. This manuscript, which contains many sentences and phrases which occurred later in the Plays and in Bacon's own works, gives some indication of how the early briefless years at Gray's Inn were most probably spent.

Many writers, Baconian and orthodox, have borne witness to the immense learning contained in the Shakespeare Folio. We would cite, amongst others, Mr. Colin Still, Mr. R. L. Eagle, Mrs. Pogson, W. F. C. Wigston, and even Professor Wilson Knight himself. As to the last named, we must confess to having found much that is delightful and instructive in his early essays on Shakespearian interpretation. That "shaping spirit of imagination "of which he writes so eloquently, is in no way to be denied. But it is still a mystery to us why Colin Still and Wilson Knight are at such pains to disclaim the possibility of "intentions" in art. To ask us to believe that the Shakespeare plays, of all conceivable writings, were no more than a kind of automatic writing penned in a state of plenary inspiration, is to tax our credulity too far. Inspiration of a high order undoubtedly exists, but there is also the evidence of much learning. If it had been simply

a question of a few inspired lyrics, this idea would be less difficult to swallow. But when legal phraseology abounds in almost every play, when social and political questions are discussed in great detail by subordinate characters, when some historical characters are lifted whole from Plutarch, the *Gesta Romanorum*, the *Decameron*, and from Holinshed, while others are deftly manipulated to embody a new dramatic intention, we must believe the evidence of classical learning combined with artistic purpose to be overwhelming. We find ourselves somewhat unwillingly thrown back upon the wise words and hard common sense of old Dr. Samuel Johnson....

> "Nature gives no man knowledge.....
> Shakespeare, however favoured by nature,
> could only impart what he had learned".

Professor Kenneth Muir's search for "sources" and his insistence upon wide reading and a classical background, are quite logical on the assumption that "Shakespeare" really wrote the Plays. In the minds of most scholars they represent a *sine qua non*. We believe that if these arguments are pursued fearlessly, they will lead to a better knowledge of the *real* author.

* * *

May, 1957, marked the three hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the landing of the first permanent English settlers at Jamestown, Virginia. The occasion was commemorated by the British Museum authorities by an exhibition of prints, drawings, maps, manuscripts, and printed books. The exhibition opened in April but closed shortly afterwards. We understand, however, that the exhibits are being shown to the public again during the Autumn. Baconians should find plenty of interest and we hope to print comments on the collection in our next issue.

It was in 1585 that a colony was originally established in North Carolina, and those who remember the series of articles we printed in 1952/53 by Manly Palmer Hall under the title "America's Assignment with Destiny", may note that several literary men were included in these pioneering ventures. The voyage and wreckage of the *Sea Venture* at the Bermuda Isles in 1609 is duly illustrated and is believed to have been the inspiration for the wreck scene in *The Tempest*. Bacon, as an organiser of the expedition, and as an original member of the Virginia Company from 1609, should surely have been given favourable notice, but his work behind the scenes is seldom recognised.

* * *

Our editorial comment on little known aspects of Bacon's early parliamentary career, and the "Vindication" by the late Kendra Baker which was re-printed in our last issue, have re-awakened the interest of people on the "university" circuit. This is very encouraging and we are reprinting the "Vindication" in the form of a small octavo pamphlet at a price of 2/- post free. It is a particularly well-documented article and almost a guide to Spedding and Dixon, into whose

volumes it will fit neatly. When reading its criticism of Spedding's "Evenings with a Reviewer" one important point must not be overlooked. Although it was reserved for Hepworth Dixon as a lawyer to clear Bacon's name absolutely from the imputation of legal corruption by establishing the existence of the "fee-system" by which in those days judges were remunerated—a fact of which Spedding seems to have been unaware—it was Spedding himself who first cleared Bacon's name in respect of his relations with Essex.

One of our first duties is to clear Bacon's name from calumny; otherwise his vital message to our civilization is likely to fall on deaf ears. There are many people who are not specially interested in the Bacon-Shakespeare controversy but are nevertheless "Baconians" in another sense, and would welcome an historical vindication of his character. All serious students should obtain a copy of this pamphlet for reference; and perhaps some of our members will be able to help us by kindly distributing one or two of them in universities or libraries.

* * *

Those of our members who are studying the cyphers will be most interested to hear of two recent developments. Mr. W. E. Lovell has sent us some very interesting decipherments which we hope to discuss further in a future issue. One of these concerns the Simple Cypher, and is taken from Archbishop Tenison's *Baconiana* 1679, the book from which our journal derives its title. Another is a biliteral decipherment of the large italic text in Camden's *Remaines of Britain,* 1657 edition, using the instructions given by Bacon himself.

The second development which will be of interest to cypherists, was a lecture given by Mr. Ingram at Canonbury Tower on Thursday, 18th July. Mr. Ingram has had long experience in cryptology and is professionally interested in electronic computers. Consequently it was most enlightening for those present to hear him elucidate such things as "probability factors", upon which most forms of cryptology depend. The culminating surprise of the evening was Mr. Ingram's disclosure of the fact that the Binary Scale, upon which the construction of modern electrical computers is based, was well known to Francis Bacon, and that this Binary Scale has been accurately and mathematically embodied in Bacon's biliteral alphabet. This discovery is of so important a nature, that Mr. Ingram, in presenting it to the Society, has asked that its copyright should be preserved. On this understanding we print in this issue a very short article outlining the principle of the discovery.

* * *

It is our pleasant duty to record honours recently received by Members of the Society. Mr. A. V. Goudie, for some years British Consul at Coquimbo, Chile, has been awarded an O.B.E.; Mr. W. F. Harris of New Zealand, working in the Department of Scientific and Industrial Research, Wellington, has been created Doctor of Science for valuable research on pollen and allied problems, by the University of

New Zealand. We offer both these gentlemen our sincere congratulations.

* * *

In compensation for the fact that we have again only been able to print two issues of BACONIANA in the calendar year, we have expanded this number to 64 pages. Even so, owing to pressure on space, we have reluctantly omitted the instalment of *Towards a more Correct Biography*, by the late Parker Woodward. We hope to include this next time.

SOME VANITY OF MINE ART

By W. G. C. Gundry

"I defy any man to give me a coherent account of the conceivable circumstances in which Bacon acquired that mastery of the stage without which the Shakespearean drama could not have been written."

Sir Henry Irving in a preface to
The Complete Works of Shakespeare.

The above statement being in the nature of a challenge, which I gladly accept, I will begin by quoting *The Times* of Nov. 14th last.....

> "On Tuesday night November 13th, 1956, Her Majesty the Queen honoured Gray's Inn with her presence at the performance of an Elizabethan Masque. The Duke of Gloucester, a Bencher of the Society, and the Duchess of Gloucester were also present. The host was this year's Treasurer, Sir Leonard Stone, Vice-Chancellor of the County Palatine of Lancaster. No reigning Sovereign has been present at a masque at one of the Inns of Court since Charles II.
>
> "The entertainment chosen was the *Masque of the Prince of Purpoole*, originally performed at Christmas 1594. The building, which in the fourteenth century became Gray's Inn, was originally the manor house of *Purpoole* or *Portpool*, and this gave his title to the Christmas prince who was chosen from among the junior members to preside over the revels of the season and rule a mock court. The masque of 1594 had been particularly elaborate in conception and presentation. It had lasted from December 20th, until the end of the twelve days of Christmas. It was resumed at Candlemas and again at Shrovetide.
>
> In the revival of these revels in 1956, the scheme of the evening's entertainment produced by Robert Atkins was to give an impression of the original, and the programme was divided into five parts. The cast, as in 1594, was again composed partly of professional actors and partly of members of the Inn. After the Queen had entered to the sound of a fanfare by four trumpeters in Elizabethan costume standing in the gallery at the lower end of the hall, she took her seat on a Chair of State set at the front of the dais.
>
> In a short prelude presenting various members of the Society in 1594-95—Lord Burleigh, Francis Bacon[1], Sir Thomas Heneage and others—the jester of the Lord of Misrule took over the authority of the Head Porter. Next the Prince of Purpoole was installed. Then a ballet of nymphs and tritons and porpoises was danced with Miss Geraldine Stephenson as Amphitrite. After an interval the fourth part of the entertainment began, in which Esquire, played by Mr. Robert Speaght, conversed with Proteus, Thamesis, and Amphitrite, in climax addressing to her Majesty the compliment paid to the first Queen Elizabeth when this scene was played before her at her court."

Thus far *The Times* report of last November; now for the historical background. In a *contemporary* report of the presentation of a device known as *A Conference of Pleasure* it is narrated that the Queen stated

1 In the actual text of the masque we must forgive an allusion to "Sir" Francis Bacon, anticipating an honour which he was not to receive until thirteen years later.

that if she had thought there had been so much said of her she would not have been there that night, and so went to bed, which was perhaps her inverted way of conveying to all present that she was quite well pleased.[2] And indeed the Toast to Queen Elizabeth I is still honoured at Gray's Inn on every Grand Night in the following words: "The glorious, pious and immortal memory of good Queen Bess."

Francis Bacon's intimate association with the masques at Gray's Inn seems obvious from the various references to him in connection with them. I quote from Mr. R. L. Eagle[3]

> "In December 1594 the *Comedy of Errors* was performed by professional players of the company to which Shakespeare was attached.
>
> There is no mention of the author in the account of the Revels, but allusion is made to a certain "*Sorcerer*" who was the *chief contriver* and who caused a stage to be erected for the performance of the play. So great was the crush of people in the Hall that the evening became known as the "night of errors".
>
> At the conclusion of the week's festivities a mock trial of the "*Sorcerer*" was held. The charges brought against him included the following:
>
> "He had caused a stage to be built, and scaffold to be reared to the top of the house to increase expectation.
>
> "Also, how he had caused divers ladies and gentlemen, and others of good condition to be invited to our sports.....
>
> "Also, that he had caused throngs and tumults, crowds and outrages to disturb our proceedings. And lastly, that he had foisted a company of base and common fellows to make up our disorders with a play of Errors and Confusions; and that night had gained to us discredit, and itself a nickname of *Errors*."
>
> Part of the prisoner's defence was that those things which they all saw and perceived sensibly to be done, and actually performed, were nothing but vain illusions, fancies, dreams and enchantments. Does not the magician, Prospero, bestow a masque upon the young couple (Ferdinand and Miranda) and call it *Some Vanity of Mine Art*?[4] The *Sorcerer's* apology is similar to what Shakespeare says through Puck in the final lines of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*[5] reminding the audience that they—
>
> "have but slumbered here
> While these visions did appear.
> And this weak and idle theme,
> No more yielding but a dream."

---

2. *The Masques of Francis Bacon* by J. S. L. Millar, *Baconiana*, Vol. XXXV, No. 141, Autumn, 1951.
3. Bacon or Shaksper, pp. 9 and 10.
4. The Tempest, Act IV, Scene 1.
5. See R. L. Eagle's *Bacon or Shakespeare, Baconiana*, Vol. XXXVII, No. 147 pp. 116-117.

It may not be without significance that in the *Comedy of Errors* (Act 1. Scene II) there is a reference to:—"Dark-working sorcerers that change the mind", and in *The Tempest* (Act. III Scene II) Caliban describes his master, Prospero, who is thought by the orthodox to represent Shakespeare, and by some Baconians to personate Bacon, as:— "a *Sorcerer* that by his cunning hath cheated me of this island". Were both these references to a *Sorcerer* hints at the "chief contriver" of masques at Gray's Inn? It may be noted that neither of these plays was printed until the *First Folio* appeared in 1623; it might be that after the lapse of nearly thirty years the *Sorcerer* might still remain *masqued*. Even then, there must have been many survivors from the rowdy scenes which marked "the night of errors" and which caused the arraignment of the "Sorcerer", whose identity must have been clear to fellow members of Gray's Inn.

It was at Gray's Inn that Bacon might have acquired that stage-craft which stood him in such good stead in writing his more ambitious stage plays. And yet Sir Henry Irving (who is quoted in a preface to this article) cannot understand how Bacon acquired his mastery of the stage and his stage-craft!! "What did Bacon know about the stage?" he asks. Evidently Sir Henry knew rather less about Bacon than either Bacon or Shakespeare knew about the stage. Bacon's references to the stage in his acknowledged prose works are frequent and pointed, though Sir Henry deliberately ignores this fact. One has only to open Bacon's *History of Henry VII*. On page 36 we read a passage which indicates how the stage was constantly in Bacon's mind as a suitable metaphor:—

> "Whereas Fortune commonly doth not bring in a *Comedie* or *Farce* after a *Tragedy*".

On page 205 we find the following passage:—

> "In all the *Devises* and *Conceits* of the *Triumphs* of this *Marriage* there was a good deal of *Astronomy*". (A reference to Prince Arthur's marriage to Princess Katherine of Aragon).

Spedding who was no supporter of the Baconian theory, believed that the speeches of the six Councillors at the mimic of the *Prince of Purpoole* were written by Bacon himself. Spedding's own words are:—

> "That the speeches of the six Councillors were written by him, and by him alone, no one who is at all familiar with his style, either of thought or expression, will for a moment doubt: they carry his signature in every sentence."

Nearly two decades later, on 20th February, 1612-13, another masque by Francis Beaumont was performed in the Banqueting Hall, Whitehall, on the occasion of the marriage of Frederick V, the Count Palatine, with Princess Elizabeth. The Solicitor-General (Sir Francis Bacon) is said to have spared "no time in the setting forth, ordering and furnishing it". It is of interest to note that this Princess Elizabeth was a direct ancestress of her present Majesty through her daughter, the Electress Sophia of Hanover. This princess, daughter of James I, became known as the "Winter Queen" and her husband, later King of Bohemia, as the "Winter King". They were driven from Bohemia during the Thirty Years War. Can it be doubted that Bacon acquired

his knowledge of the stage through the masques performed at Gray's Inn and the Court?

It seems natural for him to have used the theatre as an illustration even in his prose works; for instance:—

> "In this theatre of Men's lives it is given only to God and the angels to be lookers on".

It seems certain that the man who could write as follows must have had the stage constantly in mind. In a letter to Count Gondomar, Ambassador from the Court of Spain, dated 6th June, 1621, he wrote:—

> "Now that at once my age, my fortunes, and my genius, to which I have hitherto done but scanty justice, call me from the *stage* of active life, I shall devote myself to letters, *instruct the actors* on *it*, and serve posterity. In such a course, I shall, perhaps, find honour. And I shall then pass my life as within the verge of a better."

Again:—

> "Before the hills did intercept the eye. Or that the *frame* was up of earthly stage."
>
> (Bacon's translation of the 90th Psalm).

Compare this to the Orthodox, Revised and earlier versions in which there is no suggestion at all of a "stage."

In 1613-14 the *Maske of Flowers* was presented by the Gentlemen of Gray's Inn at the Court of Whitehall. The dedication is addressed:— "To the Verie Honourable Knight, Sir Francis Bacon, his Majestie's Attorney General" in the following terms:—

> "That you have graced in general all the Societies of the Innes of Court, in continuing them still as third persons with the Nobilitie and Court, in doing the King honour; and particularly Gray's Inne, which as you have formerly brought to flourish both in the auncienter and younger sort of countenancing vertue in every quality, so now you have made a notable demonstration thereof in the lighter and lesser serious kind".

The Maske of Flowers cost Bacon personally £3,000!

A collection of four speeches which were supposed by Spedding to be by Bacon and was entitled *A Conference of Pleasure* took the form of orations upon four themes:—

The Worthiest Virtue, or Fortitude—*The Worthiest Affection*, or Love—*The Worthiest Power*, or Knowledge—and *The Worthiest Person*, who was Queen Elizabeth herself. What a courtly piece of flattery and how pleasing to the Queen! It should be noted that the *Northumberland MS* which has both Bacon's and Shakespeare's names upon it, has also a reference to this Masque, a *Conference of Pleasure*.

To show the care of detail that inspired Bacon's study of the stage I quote the following note on colours for stage decoration which appears in his *Of Masques and Triumphs*.

> "The colours that show best by candlelight, are white, carnation, and a kind of sea-water green".

One can understand Lady Bacon with her Puritan prejudices objecting

to Anthony "mumming and masquing and sinfully revelling at Gray's Inn." Can it be doubted that Francis joined his brother in these diversions? They were not merely brothers but friends; Francis calls Anthony "my comfort".

Bacon was by nature gregarious and loved the society of his fellows, as is amply shown by the interest he took in the Gray's Inn Revels. Elsewhere we come upon further evidence of his genius for friendship. The broad-browed Verulam possessed not only brains, but a heart which urged him to labour "for the relief of the Human Estate". To be friendless would have been for him to dwell in a desert. In the conclusion to his essay, *Of Friendship*, he reverts to the stage as an illustration, indicating how much this was in his mind:—

"I have given the rule, where a man cannot fitly *play his own part*; if he have not a friend, *he may quit the stage*".

* * * *

AUTHOR'S NOTE: Acknowledgement is due to the valuable help given in the compilation of this article by Messrs. H. A. C. Sturgess, M.V.O., and W. Holden, M.B.E., the Middle Temple and Gray's Inn Librarians respectively, and the information obtained from Mr. R. L. Eagle's writings.

New Publications Strongly Recommended

BACON'S VINDICATION

by H. KENDRA BAKER

(Price 2/- including postage)

Orders for over 6 copies at reduced rates.

THE WINTER'S TALE

by BERYL POGSON

(Price 3/- including postage)

A PIONEER VI

by M.P.

"The Double Nature of Goodness"

The art of satire when applied with a rapier and not with a bludgeon, has often a stimulating quality. It is sometimes good to see an aspect of ourselves in a curved mirror. But to be condemned to this perpetually is intolerable; and in the case of Delia Bacon it was the resentment which her discoveries were bound to provoke in the orthodox mind that exposed her to this fate.

Her evidence was quite unacceptable for the reason that Shakespearian orthodoxy had already become an article of faith. All, therefore, that she could expect to see in the eyes of the faithful was a distorted image of herself as an unprincipled vandal. After the most diligent researches on this greatest of literary problems, she was met with a bland half-pitying assurance that there was really no problem at all. On the rare occasion when she was persuaded to speak frankly on the subject that was all to her, she was only to find reflected in the eyes of her listeners a mixture of incredulity, indignation, and perhaps even a vague fear of lunacy. In this atmosphere—one which Bacon would have described as "intellectual night"—it is small wonder that she was driven to write her book in solitude and seclusion. The benefit of discourse would have made her book more readable; for its arguments are profound, though perhaps too fully documented.

The only people who could really exchange with her the comfort of human understanding, were those who had no concern whatever with her work; people like the Londoner, Mr. Walker, with whom she lodged and who would take no rent; Mrs. Terrett and her little maid at the house on the banks of the Avon, and perhaps the kindly vicar at Stratford. But the intellectual and literary friends who tried so hard to help her were never quite at ease: they could not bring themselves to consider the idea that academic scholarship might be wrong, any more than a previous generation of scholars could consider the suggestion that the earth might not be flat! Hawthorne certainly recognised her talents and did all and more than was required of him. Emerson, aloof and free from embarrassment, probably went nearer to her theories than anybody; and if a man of that stature countenances a theory, its inventor may surely feel encouraged.

To Carlyle, although he was charmed by her personality, Delia's theory seemed utterly incredible. But he and his wife never allowed their sense of the ridiculous to damp her enthusiasm; and they offered her more companionship than all the others, for in her they could see and respect the eternal knight-errant, who always puts service before self. It was a pity she could not accept more of their hospitality, for she found no bitterness in Carlyle's immoderate laugh. But an unseen barrier was always present; behind the kindly humorous disposition there was a complete rejection of the philosophy which was all to her.

A few extracts from correspondence will serve to show how they both felt.....

(Carlyle to D.B.)

"We are very glad to hear of you again, and that you are doing well, and getting that wild jungle of sticks victoriously tied into fagots. That is a right success, due to all faithful workers, and which nobody can deprive one of.....

Whenever you decide on a removal you are simply to leave your things all packed at St. Albans, and come off at once to the vacant room I told you of as waiting to welcome you here—therefrom to institute whatever search your fancy and judgment points to, under the favourablest auspices. This really is the wisest, and also the easiest; Confess that it is, O you of little faith, and do it.

Yours very truly, dear Miss B.,
T. Carlyle.

(D.B. to Emerson)

"Carlyle has been to see me, though I am miles from him, to invite me to his house. I was out when he came, but he left word with the servant, and there was no alternative but for me to go, and it *was very, very pleasant.* I went at five o'clock and stayed to dinner and tea, till eleven, and Carlyle spent all the time with us, though he is extremely busy now, finishing his Life of Frederick the Second, and refuses all invitations. I have real cosy pleasant times when I go there, but I am most heartily glad I have no other acquaintances here; *they would torment me to death....*"

(Carlyle to D.B.)

"I am greatly pleased to hear of you again: my thoughts about you have been many.....My incredulity of your thesis I have never hidden from you: but I willingly vote, and have voted, that you should be heard on it to full length; and this whatever further come of it, will be a profit to the world and to yourself—I need not say what profit it will be.....When you return to London let us, so soon as possible, see you again....'

Yes, there was a satirical element in the reception which the literary world was to give to Delia; and satire, even at its best, has a de-vitalizing side to it. Sometimes a master in the art can successfully counterbalance this lethal quality by the double quality of goodness. The author of *Don Quixote* gave more than a death blow to out-moded forms of mediæval chivalry, and more too than a tonic. The gaunt knight, the fat squire, and the faithful Rosinante awake in us emotions which are far from being derisive and scornful. Mingled with the sharp and eager air of the world's greatest satire, there rises a breath of toleration and compassion. The author did not despise the puppets of his own creation, he loved them. The very word "quixotic" has come to mean something not only laughable but lovable.

It is with somewhat similar feelings that we read the story of Delia, as told by Hawthorne and Theodore Bacon; another tilting at the windmills; or was it perhaps the sheep? But however fantastic

her hopes of converting Shakespearian Orthodoxy to a new theory, we are left by her biographers with a feeling that her ideas were reasonable. Even Hawthorne admits that her interpretations of the Shakespeare plays "certainly sprang from no inconsiderable depth somewhere". He refers to "criticisms which quite take the pungency and colour out of other people's critical remarks on Shakespeare"; and he laments the fact that these gems were not separated from the rubbish "which any competent editor would have shovelled out of the way". He regards her work as one of the greatest compliments ever paid the Bard, whoever he may have been; and he gives the impression that, in some less partial academy of the future, Delia might have received a better hearing. Her mistake was in being so utterly in earnest as to attempt, single-handed, a head-long assault on the windmills of the Stratford tradition, without even the help of an editor. Very different had been the more "oblique" approach of her master, Francis Bacon, to the scholars and philosophers of his own day.

In interpreting the ancient myths Bacon himself refers more than once to the vanity of preaching above people's heads or beyond their hearts. It was, as he points out, only in the abject and miserable form of a bedraggled cuckoo that Jupiter was able to prevail upon Juno. It was useless to address people in terms beyond their understanding, and even the sacrifice of personal pride involved in "obsequiousness" was to be willingly accepted when a greater good was at stake. The peculiar lesson which he wrests from this fable supports Delia's theory, and also throws an interesting side light on the difficulties which beset the path of a courtier and would-be reformer in those days of Tudor despotism. By rebelling against authority Essex fell, accomplishing nothing but his own ruin and the execution of his friends. By respecting authority, and by a more correct estimate of its power, Bacon was able to influence it, even at risk of being thought "obsequious" by those who had no conception of what was at stake. And so, by the double nature of goodness, he was able to accomplish much.

It is not King Lear but Lord Bacon who speaks to us in those ironic words "a dog's obeyed in office". He knew so well the power, the insolence, of "office." For in dealing with human beings of whatever degree, it was necessary to appeal to the affections as well as to the reason. So that the problem posed by Delia, of an Elizabethan reformer who was looking for a way of influencing the illiterate crowd, is in every way relevant. The object was to move the whole man and not simply the rational faculty, important though that was; and it was only by combining eloquence with reason that this could be accomplished. To be content with converting the intellect alone, while leaving the emotional nature out of account and at the mercy of the appetites, was in Bacon's view idle if not dangerous. This is the pitfall of the doctrinaire and the ideologue even today.

It was for toleration in all beneficent forms that the author of the *New Atlantis* had toiled. The mortifications of the friars were approved only in so far as they were needed to establish a mastery,

whereupon they were to be discontinued. Even the body deserved its rightful heritage, and each vesture of man, including what Bacon termed "the affections", must of necessity seek its own "apparent "good. It was the supreme function of Art to provide that background of reconciliation wherein each separate "apparent good" could become merged in the "greater good" of the whole.

> "There is formed in everything a double nature of good, the one as everything is a total or substantive in itself, and the other as it is a part or member of a greater body, whereof the latter is in degree the greater and worthier because it tends to the conservation of a more general form".
>
> (Advancement of Learning)

It follows that it was a requirement of great art, though not of ordinary cheap advertisement, that it should direct its appeal to the whole nature of man, to the soul indeed, but through the senses of perception. "I take my tone from the ear of those to whom I would speak" wrote Montaigne, and over and over again Francis Bacon echoes the same advice.

It was strange that Delia, who stressed this point so often, should neglect it in the composition of her book. That her great effort in the realm of literary criticism was to rouse less interest than her own personal tragedy would have seemed to her the crowning injustice. Yet her book stood in so much need of a skilful editor that it has never to this day received the reward of a critical study. Not until Lord Bacon comes to be recognised for the genius that he was, will the pioneer work of his namesake be remembered with gratitude and respect. Meanwhile it is by her own misfortunes that she will be chiefly remembered.

Delia was one of those interesting characters who are strong enough to sacrifice the good of what Bacon called the "private and particular nature" for what they assume to be the good of all. Such people are not always a social success. Pompey the Great, in words which later held a strange fascination for Lord Bacon, has given us her maxim. While engaged in relieving a famine, and advised by his friends not to hazard himself at sea, he had replied in the memorable words *Necesse est ut eam, non ut vivam.**

But while duty was more precious to Delia than any private satisfaction she was not simply a dull and devoted slave. She could follow the eagle mind of Lord Bacon in some of its highest flights, especially in those distinctions between the good which is "communicative" and the good which is "private". She reminds us that he calls the private nature no hard names but simply urges us to treat it more scientifically.....

> "As to man, his approach or assumption to Divine and Angelical nature is *the perfection of his form*, the error or false limitation of which is the *tempest* of human life."

Probably it was the tempestuous character of Delia's own life which drew the admiration of men like Hawthorne and Emerson. True,

* "It is necessary that I go, not that I live."

neither of them felt called upon to accompany her into the storm, because her iconoclasm must have seemed to them to be too drastic and too sudden to be of much use. It was easy for such experienced writers to foresee the scorn, the derisive laughter with which her book would be greeted. "Alas, alas," Carlyle had written to Emerson, "there can be nothing but sorrow, toil and utter disappointment in it for her!.... but she troubles nobody with her difficulties, with her theories; she must try the matter to the end, and charitable souls must further her so far."

The hack critics of the periodical press, as Hawthorne calls them, were less kind. Many were the kicks and few the ha'pence which her labours earned for her. But before those kicks could find their mark Providence had placed her beyond their reach, for by then she had suffered a complete mental collapse. As might have been expected, this was hailed by her critics as a kind of judgment, But in fact it was attributable to a life of continued frustration, over-work and under-nourishment. The culminating cause of her breakdown seems to have been well apprehended by Hawthorne, and is vividly described in the chapter "Recollections of a gifted woman". Had the author of *The Scarlet Letter* been less scrupulous (so Theodore Bacon tells us) he might have made excellent copy for a novel out of the strange tragedy which was enacted at the midnight hour in the old church at Stratford-on-Avon; a story which will be told in our concluding article. But with an obvious respect for the memory of the brilliant, thoughtful and passionate creature who had confided in him, and in wise and generous words, he records her failure from the point of view of literary craftsmanship.

> "Without prejudice to her literary ability, it must be allowed that Miss Bacon was wholly unfit to prepare her own work for publication, because, among many other reasons, she was too thoroughly in earnest to know what to leave out. Every leaf and line was sacred, for all had been written under so deep a conviction of truth as to assume, in her eyes, the aspect of inspiration. A practised bookmaker, with entire control of her materials, would have shaped out a duodecimo volume full of eloquence and ingenious dissertion—criticisms which quite take the colour and pungency out of other people's critical remarks on Shakespeare—philosophic truths which she imagined herself to to have found at the roots of his conceptions, and which certainly come from no inconsiderable depth somewhere. There was a great amount of rubbish, which any competent editor would have shovelled out of the way. But Miss Bacon thrust the whole bulk of inspiration and nonsense into the press in a lump, and there tumbled out a ponderous octavo volume, which fell with a dead thump at the feet of the public, and has never been picked up. A few persons turned over one of two of the leaves, as it lay there, and essayed to kick the volume deeper into the mud;* for they were

*In a recent B.B.C. broadcast entitled "The Consul and the Gifted Woman", Delia was treated with much condescension as a brilliant but "psychological" case. Her book, however, was kicked still deeper into the mud.

> the hack critics of the minor periodical press in London, than whom, I suppose, though doubtless excellent fellows in their way, there are no gentlemen in the world less sensible of any sanctity in a book, or less likely to recognize an author's heart in it, or more utterly careless about bruising, if they do recognize it. It is their trade. They could not do otherwise. I never thought of blaming them. It was not for such Englishmen as one of these to get beyond the idea that an assault was meditated on England's greatest poet. From the scholars and critics of her own country, indeed, Miss Bacon might have looked for a worthier appreciation, because many of the best of them have higher cultivation, and finer and deeper literary sensibilities, than all but the very profoundest and brightest of Englishmen. But they are not a courageous body of men; they dare not think a truth that has an odor of absurdity, lest they should feel themselves bound to speak it out. If any American ever wrote a word in her behalf, Miss Bacon never knew it, nor did I. Our journalists at once republished some of the most brutal vituperations of the English press thus pelting their poor countrywoman with stolen mud, without even waiting to know whether the ignominy was deserved. And they never have known it, to this day, and never will. . . . . ."*

Hawthorne speaks feelingly. Alone of her countrymen he realised how little deserved this ignominy was, and he was generous enough to make a record of the fact. As to helping her editorially, he knew the hopelessness of this, for she would scarcely have tolerated the alteration of a single line. The Preface to her book which he did write makes him in a sense her one and only champion, and he was not one to have undertaken this lightly. It is beautifully and fluently written, but apart from paying a tribute to her profound scholarship, he skilfully avoids the controversial issue. A further extract from the chapter already quoted will serve to illustrate his attitude. . . . . .

> "I believe that it has been the fate of this remarkable book never to have had more than a single reader. *I myself am acquainted with it only in insulated chapters and scattered pages and paragraphs.* But since my return to America, a young man of genius and enthusiasm, has assured me that he has positively read the book from beginning to end, and is completely a convert to its doctrines. It belongs to him therefore, and not to me—whom in almost the last letter that I received from her, she declared unworthy to meddle with her work—it belongs surely to this one individual, who has done so much justice as to know what she wrote to place Miss Bacon in her due position before the public and posterity".†

If the shade of Delia Bacon could ask a boon of those who wrote in memory of her, it would be that they should put her work—"The Philosophy of the Shakespeare Plays Unfolded"—before herself. In commemorating her centenary it is therefore our duty to indicate certain profundities of thought and insight for which she has never yet

---

*"Our Old Home" by Nathaniel Hawthorne.

†Unfortunately this gentleman died young before attempting to fulfil the charg e laid upon him.

received due credit. At the same time it must be confessed that there are great obstacles to the fluent reading of her book; one of these is her habit of referring to historical characters and authors, not by name, but by a sort of flippant post-impressionism. Montaigne is referred to variously as the "Gascon Philosopher," the "Philosopher of the Mountain", "Michael of the Mount," or "the Mayor of Bordeaux". Shakspere is "the old player", "the manager of the Globe theatre" and sometimes "Lord Leicester's Groom"!

To the reader whose knowledge of contemporary literature and Elizabethan history does not enable him to jump with Delia, the going is extremely hard.....

> "Of course, it was perfectly competent for a Gascon whose gasconading was understood to be without any motive beyond that of vanity and egotism, and without any incidence to effects, to say, in the way of mere foolery many things which an English statesman could not then so well endorse. And in case his personality were called in question, there was the mountain to retreat to, and the saint of the mount, in whose behalf the goose is annually sacrificed by the English people, the saint under whose shield and name the great English philosopher sleeps."

By making us fly in this fashion from a small mountain in France to St. Michael's Church, St. Albans, Delia tends to obscure the real point of the paragraph, which is important. For Montaigne really does give us a clue to the Baconian rhetoric. The advantages which he seems to have enjoyed as a self-appointed gossip—the "cap and bells" which he apparently assumed for discussing revolutionary ideas—these things bring home to us the far more delicate position of Francis Bacon at the court of Elizabeth or James. They indicate what sort of disguise he would have to assume in order to avoid any direct collision with Authority—what kind of "weeds" he would need to wear.....

> "I have, though in a despised weed, procured
> the good of all men". (Bacon's Prayer)

Now the good of all men, or Philanthropia, as he called it, was the mainspring of Bacon's life and purpose. But there is nothing to indicate what could have been this "despised weed", unless perchance it was the motley coat of Jaques. But do we really need to go to that solitary humorist, or to the Mayor of Bordeaux, to see what sort of "Art or Delivery" would be required by men in the position of Bacon? Obviously it must "take its tone from the ear of those to whom they would speak". The common touch—that was the channel, the only channel, by which philosophy could be brought down from the clouds, by which plain men could be reached. Self-appointed "do-gooders" were suspect even in Bacon's day; the play was the thing. Ariel was to be sent off on an errand to round up the actors.....

> "....Go bring the rabble
> O'er whom I give thee power
> Here to this place."

It was only by means of an art-form which would be intelligible to the crowd that any real progress could be made in philosophy. It was not that high ideals were lacking; they had been in the world for many ages. What was lacking, according to Bacon, was "the husbandry thereunto"; and by this he meant a way of introducing and diffusing these ideals among the illiterate many; a way by which all men could share vicariously the joys, sufferings and experience of a Hotspur, a Falstaff or a Macbeth.

Books, after all, could only speak to those who could read. They could not bring the rabble *here to this place*. To do this it was necessary for all emotions, passions and mental states, all abstract principles such as rage, fear, cruelty, jealousy, ambition, honour, love,—to be incarnated and impersonated and brought upon the stage. The "apparent" good of entertainment was to be the means of bringing men to the real good of their souls.

High ideals had been preached, now the science of them was to be given. That was what our author was trying to achieve. The *Novum Organum*, as Delia reminds us, was not invented simply for the purpose of examining such things as spiders' legs, although the author himself.....

> "would not have disdained to put it to such use if he had had the time and if his intention had not been so much distracted by the habits and history of that nobler kind of vermin which he found feeding on the commonweal and eating the heart out of it".

Consider for a moment the historical background. In those days, quite apart from the obvious need of useful scientific discoveries, there was an even greater need for the re-establishment of an Exemplar. The great religion of love had already taken a disastrous slant, and the standards of human conduct were badly confused. The highest ministers and executives of the Holy Church were indulging in unrestrained cruelty, and neither protestants nor infidels were above such enormities. There was need to rebuild and re-establish a "Platform and Exemplar of Goodness".* There was imperative need for a system by which private benefit could be identified with service for the good of all. There was a requirement for a yardstick or pattern by which the self-regarding emotions could be judged, by which "Virtue herself could be seen."*

Bacon himself had reported this deficiency . Did he do anything more? It was Delia who saw, two and a half centuries later, that an attempt had actually been made to supply a small part of it with a Folio of thirty-six stage-plays. It was not a bad start. It was not a bad way of holding up a mirror to the world,—a graded series of Histories, Tragedies, Comedies, and Mysteries. And all these were no longer in the form of chronicles to be read only by the few, but transfigured into a form which could be witnessed by the many.

The double nature of goodness runs like a silver thread through the Shakespeare Plays. Like the quality of mercy itself "it is twice blessed". Rascals like Jack Falstaff, Fluellen, Pistol, Edmund, and

---

* *Advancement of Learning.*

Caliban, and even villains like Iago, Macbeth, and Richard II, can teach us more about our lesser selves than all the sermons in the world.

In the story of Delia Bacon we have witnessed a surrender of all that life could offer for the sake of what she supposed to be a greater good. Whether this good existed only in her imagination, or whether it will one day become manifest, is a question we must leave to the reader. The answer will depend on his view of the purpose, if any, of the Shakespeare Plays. Were they written as a business proposition—a private good—or is it conceivable that the author, whoever he was, may have been indifferent to gain or glory, and commanded by a loftier motive? Were they the product of "untutored carefree genius", the "native warbling of wood notes wild", or were they written and re-written, twisted and altered for half a life-time to keep pace with an expanding, all-embracing mind of a genius like Bacon whom Shelley described as the greatest poet-philosopher since Plato?*

To us there can be but one answer and it is that which Delia, after years of study succeeded in ravelling out. For she sought and found in this great enterprise, not only the platform but the pattern of Goodness, and it became her star to guide her to the end. And when in order to follow it and complete her work, it became clear that she must leave her native America and live in penury and discomfort in England, her independent New England spirit must have answered in some such words as those of Pompey the Great. "It is necessary that I go, not that I live".

(*To be concluded*)

*Translator's preface to "The Banquet", Percy Bysshe Shelly.

FRANCIS BACON AND THE ELECTRONIC COMPUTER

by JACOBITE

For many ages we have counted, added, multiplied, and divided in the scale of ten, until we have grown so used to it that we do not admit the necessity, or the possibility, of any other mode of arithmetic.

The decimal system is certainly due to the fact that we have ten digits on our hands which serve as a 'noiseless' portable computer, admirably suited to clandestine use if necessary, and meeting with the approbation of students of all ages for these very reasons. In the case of human beings it is easy to see why the scale was not extended to twenty! Small wonder then that the system has insinuated itself into our minds to the exclusion of other scales, such as twelve for instance, which in some quarters is held to be more logical, since it has two, three, four, and six, as factors. Ten is nevertheless a very convenient scale when there are ten different conditions, classes or states to deal with.

But Nature is not always so accommodating, and a number of things exist in two states only, the most notable instance being of course male and female; our knowledge of the human species of the latter gender being sadly deficient owing to the unreasonable inability of the male to comprehend a scale of infinite variation. Other instances are:

A statement is true or false,
A piece of material is a magnet or not a magnet,
An electrical switch is on or off,
A lamp is alight or not alight.

In the latter instances, since the device can be changed from one state to another in a few micro-seconds, it is possible and convenient to count at an enormous speed, provided we use the scale of TWO. All modern electronic computers use this scale, including ERNIE of Premium Bond fame.

Let us then consider this scale. The highest number will be one, that is one less than the radix of the scale, the position occupied by 9 in the scale of Ten, or Denary Scale as it is called today. When we move a digit one place to the left we multiply it by two, not by ten as in the Denary.

Thus 1 will indicate unity,
10 ,, ,, one x two, i.e. two,
100 ,, ,, one x two x two, i.e. four.

Adding one to four we will get 101, i.e. five, and so on, as set out below.

The writer is engaged in work utilising this scale, and, being a cryptographer of sorts, was searching for a mnemonic by which to remember Lord Bacon's Biliteral Alphabet, when he was astounded to find it identical with the Binary, as will be seen below.

The Binary Scale

0	1	2	3	4	5
00000	00001	00010	00011	00100	00101
6	7	8	9	10	11
00110	00111	01000	01001	01010	01011
12	13	14	15	16	17
01100	01101	01110	01111	10000	10001
18	19	20	21	22	23
10010	10011	10100	10101	10110	10111

Francis Bacon's Biliteral Alphabet

A	B	C	D	E	F
aaaaa	aaaab	aaaba	aaabb	aabaa	aabab
G	H	I	K	L	M
aabba	aabbb	abaaa	abaab	ababa	ababb
N	O	P	Q	R	S
abbaa	abbab	abbba	abbbb	baaaa	baaab
T	V	W	X	Y	Z
baaba	baabb	babaa	babab	babba	babbb

A first reading of mathematical history on the subject of the antiquity of the scale gives the first positive date of its use as 1671, when Leibniz produced a calculating machine using binary digits, and demonstrating the superiority of the scale for this purpose. The literature on the subject is somewhat vague and indefinite, which is surprising when it is considered that almost any history will give such things as the numerology of the Ancient Egyptians. It may be, however, that this article will stimulate some enquiry into the matter. It is known that Napier, who published the first paper on logarithms in 1614, was in collaboration with Briggs, who first published tables of logarithms to base ten in 1624. It is believed that evidence exists of collaboration between Napier and Bacon at about that time.

What is quite positive, and very gratifying, is the rigid accuracy of the Biliteral Alphabet. Bacon said, in effect, "let 'a' equal nought, and 'b' equal one", and then wrote out the numbers zero to twenty-three *in the binary scale*. It is to be expected that his directions on the use of the Biliteral and other cyphers would be just as precise and accurate. Applying these directions to an enigmatic passage in the First Folio has yielded a surprising result to the writer, which it is hoped to communicate in the near future. Therein, Bacon gently demonstrates the danger of jumping to conclusions!

As a final thought let no one imagine that this odd count invalidates another which is even simpler!

TRUTH BROUGHT TO LIGHT

In 1651 there was published a little Book entitled "Truth Brought to Light and Discovered by Time" which purports to give an account of certain events during the first 14 years of the reign of King James. In 1692 a second Edition was published. The 1651 Edition contains a frontispiece (See plate 1) and the 1692 Edition contains a similar frontispiece but different in detail (see plate 2).

Truth Brought
to Light by Time
or the most Remar
kable Transactions
of the first
fourteen years
of King James
Reign.
Printed for Ric. Baldwin

"TRUTH BROUGHT TO LIGHT"

By Edward D. Johnson

There is a little book entitled Truth Brought to Light and discovered by Time or A discourse and Historicall Narration of the first XIIII yeares of King James Reigne. London 1651. The Frontispiece is a picture full of unexplained emblems of great interest which have no connection with the contents of the book.

It must be noted that at the bottom of the picture are the words JOHN DROESHOUT SCULPSIT, and he was evidently a member of the Droeshout family one of whom, Martin Droeshout, was employed by Francis Bacon to produce the dummy mask picture of Shakspere in the First Folio.

There was another edition of this book dated 1692 but *this second edition makes no reference to the Book dated* 1651 *and suppresses many parts which were in the first edition.* A similar picture appears in the second edition but entirely re-engraved, and altered in a number of particulars.

It is submitted that the picture in the 1651 edition of this book discloses the fact, among others, that Bacon was of royal birth—for the following reasons.

In the centre of the picture at the top is a throne, and sitting on the throne is a picture of a significant figure in exactly the same attitude as Francis Bacon in the Gorhambury Monument except that in the monument the right hand is hanging down, and in the picture the right hand is resting on a skull placed on a coffin or covered table. The man on the throne is shown wearing an ermine-trimmed robe, and ermine is the emblem, dignity, or office of a judge so there seems no question as to the identity of the figure. To confirm that the man is sitting on a throne, we see on a panel at the back of the throne a coat of arms with a crown above, and at the feet the Royal crown and sceptre. Above the throne is a curtain-rail with two curtains suspended from it. There are two figures who have drawn back the curtains to disclose the sitter on the throne. The figure on the left is that of Truth with her right hand pointing to the rays of the sun, and the figure on the right is that of Time, since on his chest is the dial of a clock, in his left hand is Time's scythe, and at the top of the scythe is a crescent moon, which appears on the boar in Bacon's crest. Above Time's head are two stars as in Bacon's coat of arms.

I shall be glad if opponents of the Royal Birth Theory will answer the following two questions:

1. If we must agree this man was Bacon but was not of royal birth, why is he depicted as sitting on a throne with the crown and sceptre at his feet?
2. If Bacon's life was an open one, as it was according to official history, why are Truth and Time pulling back the curtains to disclose the figure of Bacon on a throne?

The figure has white hair, and his eyes are closed, which seems to indicate that in his old age Bacon is dreaming of what he has lost.

The figure of Truth has one foot pressing down the head of a prostrate man with the other foot resting on one of the man's arms. Could this man represent Cecil, who was Bacon's enemy? The figure of Time has one foot resting on one of the legs of a skeleton, with the other foot resting on one of the arms of the skeleton. On the bones of the pelvis of the skeleton appear the initials W.S., which seems to indicate that the skeleton is intended for William Shakspere being pressed down by Time. Passing under one of the legs of the skeleton is an arrow or spear.

The lower section on the right, shows a man sitting at a table with one hand holding a pen and the other resting on a scroll. Beneath the table is a young man, holding in his left hand a broken cross, and the man at the table has both feet treading down the young man.

Could this represent Bacon, as a young man, being kept down by Burghley?

The lower section on the left shows a hump-backed man seated at a table writing in a large book, with one foot resting on a middle-aged man leaning on his elbow, who might represent Bacon being crushed by his greatest enemy, the hunch-back Cecil.

Between the upper and lower sections on the right and left hand sides of the picture, are shelves containing bound and clasped books,and also scrolls. These appear to be behind what *seem to be iron grills, to show that hidden books* are now being brought to light.

The centre section shows a tree, from which hang five books and three scrolls. This may be taken to represent the Tree of Knowledge, and the books and scrolls its fruits. Resting on a coffin in front of the tree we see a candlestick with a *lighted* candle, and a flower-pot holding a *growing* plant. On the flower pot is one of the mask faces which are often seen in books written by Bacon.

The coffin might be taken to represent the dead past, and the lighted candle and growing flowers, the emblems of truth which never die.

* * *

When we come to the frontispiece to the edition of this book dated 1692, we get a number of surprises.

The figure of Bacon has now disappeared, and in its place is a picture of a younger man with dark hair, who might be taken for King James with his thin rickety legs. The figure of Truth has trodden down the man with the crutch, and the figure of Time has trodden down the skeleton of W.S. We thus see that all Baconian indications have been purposely removed for some reason.

Bacon's signatures inserted in exactly the same way as in Don Adriana's Letter can be found.

1. In the first 25 lines of page 1 of this book.
2. In the first 25 lines of an address in Latin headed, "The Stationer to the Impartiall Reader".
3. In the 30 lines of 5 verses in the 1692 edition, entitled "The Emblematical Title Explained".

I believe that Bacon produced this book in his lifetime, as a true record of certain events with which he had been connected, and gave instructions for both editions to be published after his death.

DR. WILLIAM HARVEY AND FRANCIS BACON

The tercentenary year from the date of Dr. William Harvey's death in 1657 has drawn public attention to the fundamental importance to the medical world of his discovery of the circulation of the blood. Without his lectures and book *Exercitatio Anatomica De Motu Cordis Et Sanguinis in Animalibus*, physiological science would have had no basic principles on which to base the modern comparatively advanced knowledge of the structure and behaviour of the human body.

Baconians may find some significance in the facts that the treatise was first published in 1628 at *Frankfurt*, and was, apparently, full of typographical errors. It contains, by modern standards, a fulsome Address to the King, and has been described as the beginning of modern experimental science! Certainly Dr. Harvey was indefatigable in his pursuit of truth and showed the hall-mark of a great mind, namely indifference to the unfriendly reception accorded to his ideas when these became generally known.

Sir Geoffrey Keynes, in the *Times* of June 3rd, pointed out that the MS. notes of Harvey's Lumleian Lectures, delivered at the College of Physicians, bore the date 1616. He remarked that two pages summarizing the Doctor's views on the blood circulation, were written, judging from calligraphical evidence, at a different time from the remainder. If the pages were in fact inserted later, then the date of the original announcement of Harvey's theory becomes uncertain, and it is feasible that the theory was known to a privileged few before 1616. Shaksper, however, would hardly have been *persona grata* in such circles though Francis Bacon most certainly would (Dr. Harvey was attached to the Courts of both Queen Elizabeth and King James I). In any case, *Coriolanus*, as mentioned in *Francis Bacon's Milieu* in our last number, was not published until 1623. Bacon might well have decided to include the reference to the circulation of the blood when revising *Coriolanus* after 1616. Whereas Shaksper died in April of that year, when the first Lumleian Lectures were delivered. We know that William Harvey was later sent abroad on missions to Europe for the King, and apparently Frankfurt was visited by him. Would he have met Francis Bacon there between 1626 and 1628, and why was *De Motu Cordis* published there and not in England?

Sir Geoffrey Keynes is an Emeritus Surgeon of St. Bartholomew's Hospital and an authority on Harveian medical theory. A copy of his erudite book *The Portraiture of William Harvey* can be consulted in the Library of the Royal College of Physicians, and contains references to all the known pictures of this brilliant physician, although only a few of these are believed to be genuine likenesses. Perhaps the best known of all hangs in a place of honour in the Library, is thought to have been in the possession of the College since before 1666, and is attributed to Cornelius Jansen.

Keynes says: "The canvas has suffered serious damage in the region of the right hand which has been badly repainted." The reason for this mutilation is unknown, but "the position of the fingers suggests that it formerly held some object such as a scroll". The fingers of both hands, to our mind, seem to indicate that Dr. Harvey is pointing at the same object to the left of the picture, which is a table or stone pedestal adjacent to the base of a Corinthian pillar at the side of the sitter's chair: behind his head is a billowing curtain, and to the left of the pillar and Harvey's right, clouds overhanging the sun.

John Aubrey in his *Brief Lives*, mentions two verbal references by Harvey to Francis Bacon, and the *savants* evidently knew each other well. Could there be some unexplained significance in the symbology and history of the portrait discussed?

N.F.

Book Review

THE WINTER'S TALE
by Beryl Pogson

This interpretation of *The Winter's Tale* is unashamedly mystical, and indeed it is questionable if a systematic explanation of the theme and characterisation is possible in any other way.

Eleven of Shakespeare's other plays have already been interpreted esoterically by Mrs. Pogson, and we impatiently await further essays of this kind from such an understanding pen, in the hope that, in due course, fresh light will be thrown on the plan governing the whole thematic structure of the 1623 Folio, which contains in all thirty-six plays.

Mrs. Pogson is an Honours Graduate of London University; but her academic learning is leavened with a deeper understanding by which alone the mysteries of Greek mythology and the ancient wisdom woven into the text of *The Winter's Tale* can be revealed. The introduction of the Delphic Oracle in Act III, Scene II, and the Divine Message obtained therefrom, signal to the audience the overt intervention of a Higher Power in the action of the Play, and the ultimate triumph of Good over Evil is skilfully "dedicated to the raising of Man's consciousness" through analogy and emotional appeal. Mrs. Pogson traces the great playwright's plot to the end, and no one can read her booklet without enriching his mind from the treasury of Shakespeare's trancendental ideas. N.F.

DID CHRISTOPHER MARLOWE WRITE SHAKESPEARE?

By T. Wright

A major problem confronting the orthodox Shakespearian critic, is having to explain how the man of Stratford-on-Avon could have been the author of the earliest plays, which first appeared at times when it was physically impossible for him to have written them. Usually the critic's subterfuge is to deny that these early appearances were of Shakespeare origin, and to ascribe their authorship to other writers, and particularly Greene, Peele and Marlowe. In certain cases, Shakespeare is brought in as a collaborator, while, in others, he is represented to be the bare-faced plagiarist; as seen in the following examples:—

(a) *Sidney Lee—The Troublesome Reign of King John*

It has been conjectured with great probability that Greene, Peele, and Marlowe were concerned in the composition of this old History and it is barely possible that Shakespeare, who seems to have begun his career as their humble co-labourer, contributed something to it, as like in style to what they wrote as he could make it.

(b) *Cambridge History of English Literature—Locrine*

.....It borrows freely from Kyd, Marlowe, Greene, Peele, and Lodge, and from Spenser's *Complaints.*

(c) *Sidney Lee—Henry VI. Parts I, II, III.*

Criticism has proved beyond doubt that in these plays Shakespeare did no more than add, revize and correct other men's work.....Much can be said too in behalf of the suggestion that Shakespeare joined Marlowe.....It is probable that Marlowe began his final revision, but his task was interrupted by his death and the lion's share of the work fell to his younger coadjutor.

When it is realized that all the dramatists mentioned above were contemporaries, it will be difficult to believe that such blissful conditions could have then prevailed, and that they were the happy band of unselfish, disinterested collaborators as represented. There is no reason for believing that they were any different from the writers of today, of whom it is expected that each will naturally seek to gain his own public. Certainly the records of those times have more to tell of discord and strife and personal attack amongst the writers, than of harmony.

Now, into the arena comes a new critic, neither orthodox nor Baconian. One Calvin Hoffman, an American, who in his book *The Man who was Shakespeare*, 1955, asserts that it was Christopher Marlowe who was the author of "Shakespeare", and without collabor-

ation with any other writer. The book reminds us that doubts about the authorship of "Shakespeare" were first ventilated one hundred years ago, and that the first dissenters were Baconians. Yet he has nothing to say about the Baconian evidence, as such, that has since amassed, except when using it to show up the myth of the orthodox belief. His search for the true author began nineteen years ago in Long Island. In a fit of desperation at not being in the mood for writing, he collected from the local library the works of Kyd, Greene, Lyly, Marlowe and Jonson, and proceeded to read these for a month. Of all the Elizabethan plays that he read he "came to know and like those of Christopher Marlowe the best and noted, therein, resemblances of phrases, expressions and lines with which he was familiar in 'Shakespeare'." This was his "first clue", and as these became more abundant, he was persuaded that "it *must* be Marlowe"; and eventually we find him saying that, "From the almost unlimited parallelisms that I have drawn from the works of Marlowe and Shakespeare, the verdict must be that the plays and poems of these two authors were written by the same person." With that finding we, of course, agree, but, as has been demonstrated again and again, and without serious challenge, the "person" was Francis Bacon.

Mr. Hoffman, having convinced himself that it was Marlowe who wrote "Shakespeare," then proceeds to explain away the obstacles to such a belief which then became apparent. First, as regards Marlowe's personal life. He was of dissolute habits and, at the time of his assassination, was under arrest as a blaspheming atheist. To this, Mr. Hoffman adds the unpleasant suggestion that Sir Thomas Walsingham was Marlowe's secret lover, and is at some pains to excuse his man on the score that he was but the product of the times. Indeed, an unworthy and unwarranted suggestion; and certainly not the background from which one would expect the sublime philosophy of "Shakespeare" to emerge. As to Marlowe's scholastic and academic attainments, we read in *The Works of Christopher Marlowe, 1885,* by A. H. Bullen, the recognised orthodox editor,—"There is nothing whatever to show that Marlowe was distinguished for industry at school.....it may be safely said that the poet could not have earned much distinction at Cambridge for sound classical knowledge." Mr. Hoffman, however, without giving any supporting evidence, thinks that "Christopher Marlowe's qualifications for authorship are stunning:" "his reputation as a dramatist was established while he was still young". "It is probable that even before Marlowe was awarded his B.A., he had written, in his nineteenth and twentieth years, most of the plays that bear his name." Marlowe's early death, before most of the Shakespeare plays had appeared, must have been Mr. Hoffman's greatest obstacle, but he has been equal to the occasion! In desperation he writes—"There is only one way of slashing through this hedgerow of contradictions. Christopher Marlowe was not murdered at Deptford." Marlowe, is, therefore, resurrected and, with the aid of Walsingham, is spirited away to Italy, where he continues to write the plays, which he sends back to Walsingham. The latter decides that

these must be published, but not in Marlowe's name, and so goes to the London playhouses to "seek out some obscure actor who would for ample remuneration lend his name". Of course, he finds William Shakespeare, as he is called by Mr. Hoffman. How, when and where this all happened we are not told, and, with that short reference, the "obscure actor" is dismissed from the scene. As to the original manuscripts of Marlowe's supposed writings of the plays, Walsingham took "his dangerous secret to the grave with him." We read of Mr. Hoffman's intention to secure the opening of the Walsingham family tomb to find the manuscripts; but we now know that the tomb has since been opened and nothing found. This failure seems to have shaken Mr. Hoffman's unstable belief, for according to the Press,* he is now offering many thousands of pounds for any proof of Marlowe's being alive after his alleged murder in 1593. It is reported that, already, a titled Englishman has gone to Italy in the search; but why not save time, money and labour, by first testing out the declaration made by Francis Bacon in his cipher writings,† that "Marlow is also a pen name employed ere taking Wm. Shakespeare's as our masque or vizard"?

Mr Hoffman writes that the orthodox belief in the man of Stratford-on-Avon, is based solely on the fragile foundation that the name William Shakespeare appears on the titlepage of some of the plays. But, that is precisely what he himself has done as regards the works attributed to Marlowe; and, when he asks us to accept Christopher Marlowe as an alternative to Will Shakspere, he is but expecting us to change from one myth to an even greater one. He gives not the slightest hint that Marlowe's supposed authorship of those works was ever in doubt, nor, in any way seeks to justify his own belief in it, although much has been written to show that Marlowe could not have been the author. The name Marlowe, as of an author, was not known, at any time during Christopher Marlowe's lifetime. Only one of the works later attributed to him was published during his lifetime, and that anonymously. It was *Tamburlaine*, of which Bullen wrote—"It is difficult to overestimate the importance of *Tamburlaine* in the history of the English drama; .....but we have no decisive piece of external evidence to fix the authorship on Marlowe". *Faustus*, the next work in importance, was not entered in the Stationers' Register until seven years after Marlowe's death, the entry being made by Thomas Bushell, one-time secretary to Francis Bacon, who did not have it printed until after another four years. A new edition appeared, twenty-three years after Marlowe's death, showing the play much altered and enlarged, with new characters and incidents. The latter included (a) the persecutions of Bruno, (b) the treachery of Dr. Lopez, and (c) the return of Essex from Ireland, all of which transpired *after* Marlowe's death. The *Jew of Malta* is of special interest. It was entered in the Stationers' Register a year after Mar-

* "Daily Telegraph," 13.7.1956.

† "The Bi-literal Cypher of Francis Bacon," by E. W. Gallup, 1900, p.3.

lowe's death, but not published until 1633, i.e. forty years after his death. The play is mentioned once only in the cipher writings of Francis Bacon, in that part embodied in Bacon's *Sylva Sylvarum* of 1635, i.e. two years after the play's publication; and the reasonable explanation of this, made by Parker Woodward in his "Tudor Problems" 1909, is that it was specially printed in 1633, in order that some additional cipher matter might be incorporated. There is mystery also about the remainder of the, so-called, "Marlowe" works, but sufficient has here been written to show what a very, very "fragile foundation" Mr. Hoffman has for his *own* belief in Marlowe as being the author of "Shakespeare".

As we have seen, Mr. Hoffman's belief is based entirely on the occurrence of "resemblances of phrases, expressions and lines" which he found were common to both "Marlowe" and "Shakespeare". But such resemblances are to be found in profusion and with equal significance in the works of the other authors of the same period which Mr. Hoffman says he has read. The following examples are all of the same period, 1594, and found in Works which were then anonymous, but, later, ascribed to the authors named:—

Shakespeare:

I am farre better borne then is the King:
More like a King, more Kingly in my thoughts
2 Henry VI, v,1,

Peele:

This princely mind in thee
Argues the height and honour of thy birth.
Battle of Alcazar

Greene:

Selim thy mind in kingly thoughts attire *Selimus*

Marlowe:

This kindness to thy King, argues thy noble mind and disposition. *Edward II*

Shakespeare:

O comfort-killing Night, image of Hell,
Dim register, and notarie of shame,
Blacke stage for tragedies, and murthers fell,
Vast sin-concealing Chaos, nourse of blame. *Lucrece*
Darke Night, dread Night, the silence of the Night,
Wherein the Furies maske in hellish troupes.
The Contention

Peele:

The silence of the Speechless Night,
Dire architect of murders and misdeeds.
Battle of Alcazar.

Kyd:

Night, the coverer of accursed crimes,
With pitchie silence husht these traitors harmes,
Spanish Tragedie.

The silent deeps of dead-sad Night,
where sins do mask unseen. *Cornelia.*

In *Troilus and Cressida*, Hector addresses Paris and Troilus as being "not much unlike young men, whom Aristotle thought unfit to hear moral philosophy". This is generally held to be a mistake of Shakespeare's, the word "moral" being a mistranslation of the Greek work "politikes"; and the orthodox critic hailed it with delight as proving Ben Jonson's statement, in the Shakespeare Folio, that its author had "small Latin and less Greek". But, precisely this so-called "mistake" is found also in Francis Bacon's *Advancement of Learning* 1605, where he asks, "Is not the opinion of Aristotle worthy to be regarded, wherein he saith, 'That young men are no fit auditors of moral philosophy?'" In the fuller work, *De Augmentis* 1623, this is rendered—"And it is a very prudent saying of Aristotle, deserving to be well considered, that 'young men are improper hearers of moral philosophy'." From the context, it is plain that Bacon fully understood Aristotle's meaning, and that there was no mistranslation; moreover, as Bacon was an accomplished Greek scholar at the age of 14 years, he was not likely to have made one. Surely, it is unreasonable to believe that two contemporary writers, working quite independently, made this exceptional use of Aristotle's saying; and we can but conclude that the entry in *Troilus and Cressida* was made by the author of *De Augmentis*: certainly not by Marlowe.

This parallelism between "Shakespeare" and Francis Bacon is but one of a profusion found in Bacon's writings generally, in his correspondence and his speeches; and these must therefore, represent the spontaneous expression of his thoughts. If, then, these as found in "Shakespeare" are equally spontaneous in character, as indeed they are, it seems impossible to escape the conviction that Bacon must have been responsible for their being there. The following are examples:—

SHAKESPEARE	BACON
To thine own self be true, And it must follow, as the night the day, Thou canst not then be false to any man. *Hamlet*	Be so true to thyself as thou be not false to others. Essay *of Wisdom*
The ivy which had hid my princely trunk, And sucked my verdure out on't *Tempest*	It was ordained that this winding-ivy of a Plantagenet should kill the tree itself. *History of Henry VII*
I shall show the cinders of my spirits, Through the ashes of my chance. *Antony and Cleopatra*	The sparks of my affection shall ever rest quick under the ashes of my fortune. *Lr. to Falkland*
Lo! as at English feasts, so I regreet The daintiest last, to make the end most sweet *Richard II*	Let not this Parliament end like a Dutch feast in salt meats, but like an English feast in sweet meats. *Speech in Parliament* 1604
Love will creep in service where it cannot go. *Two Gentlemen of Verona*	Love must creep where it cannot go. *Letter to King James*

But, by far the most convincing evidence in this respect is Francis Bacon's private note-book, *Promus of Formularies and Elegancies*. It is in the British Museum, and consists of 50 folio sheets, with 1680 entries, all in Bacon's own handwriting, except for 200 French proverbs, and was compiled about 1594-1596. It seems to have been by way of a "provision or preparatory store for the furniture of speech and readiness of invention" such as Bacon recommends in his *Advancement of Learning*: a collection, added to from time to time, of pithy and suggestive sayings, terms of expression, English and foreign proverbs and terms, etc. Spedding, Francis Bacon's biographer, states that only a small proportion of the entries can be traced in any of Bacon's acknowledged works, and that clearly, these were not intended to assist in the composition of his graver efforts. In 1883, Mrs. Henry Pott, founder of the Francis Bacon Society, published a transcript of the *Promus* with which she coupled the results of her efforts to trace the works in which the *Promus* entries were used. Her book is monumental evidence of the prodigious labour she undertook, in searching upwards of 5,300 works of 328 known authors of the 15th, 16th and 17th centuries; 118 pieces by unknown authors; and 894 plays by 75 authors of the 18th century. Mrs Pott found the *Promus* entries scattered throughout the Shakespeare Plays, 'thick as autumnal leaves that strow the brooks in Vallombrosa'. It is asserted that, broadly, the English, French, Italian, Spanish and Latin proverbs in the *Promus* and quoted in "Shakespeare" are not found in other literature of the 15th, 16th and 17th centuries. Of about 200 English terms of expression in the *Promus*, only 17 have been discovered, between the 15th and 18th centuries, other than in Bacon's prose works and the Shakespeare Plays. Folio No. 111 of the *Promus* is of particular interest, for it would seem that this page of items must have been before Francis Bacon as he wrote *Romeo and Juliet*. The following, *Promus* items from this folio, or their equivalent, are found within eleven consecutive lines of the play (II. 3):—

> Romẽ (with its abbreviation sign); good morrow; sweet for speech of the morning; early rising; lodged; golden sleep; uprouse.

The last-mentioned, "uprouse", appears here, in *Romeo and Juliet*, for the first time in English literature, and we may, therefore, safely infer that it came there from Francis Bacon's private notebook.

Throughout the Shakespeare Plays, there is the spontaneous expression of Scriptural teaching, and even the actual repetition of words and phrases, indicating clearly that the author's mind must have been saturated with Bible truths. That fact alone would seem to rule out any possibility of the author being Marlowe, the blaspheming atheist. But Francis Bacon fits the role completely. Spedding wrote that Bacon's acknowledged writings were, for the most part, plentifully "stuffed" with quotations from the Bible and from classical authors. In his *De Augmentis* (Book VIII, Chap II), Bacon gives his explanation of thirty-four parables taken from Proverbs and Ecclesiastes in the Bible, and he shows particular interest in the eleventh

of these, from Ecclesiastes X. 1; *and so also does* Shakespeare: both returning to it again and again, and drawing from it analogy after analogy. The eminent surgeon W. S. Melsome, in his wonderful little book *The Bacon-Shakespeare Anatomy*, 1945, devotes his study to these analogies and resemblances, and, using Bacon's own method, by "diligent dissection and anatomy," anatomizes the mind of Bacon and also that of the author of "Shakespeare", arriving at the inescapable truth that the two minds were one. The parable of Ecclesiastes X.1 is briefly the analogy between the corruption of the best ointment by putrid flies, and the corruption of the best men by vice. From this, Bacon deduced (a) that "honours make both virtue and vice conspicuous", (b) that the corruption of a man reputed for wisdom and honour is worse than the corruption of an ordinary man; and so on, leading up to the general conclusion—"Ye know the principle of philosophy to be that the corruption or degeneration of the best things is the worst." Bacon sometimes varied the metaphor from flies in the ointment to flaws in fairest crystal and precious stones. Shakespeare *did likewise*, likening the eminent man having flaws in his character to a fair and crystal sky in which are ugly clouds—"the more fair and crystal is the sky, the uglier seem the clouds that in it fly" (*Richard II: I. i.* 41). As with Bacon, Shakespeare preferred to liken the best men and women to the best precious stones. It is not possible within the compass of this article to enlarge upon this, but it is hoped that my reader will, himself, make Melsome's fascinating little book his study. He will then certainly realize that both Francis Bacon and the author of "Shakespeare" were closely acquainted with the Bible and had read it with spiritual insight, which could not have been possible with the reprobate atheist Marlowe.

The Bible parable has nothing to say about the *ordinary* man, but Bacon has much to say, drawing a clear distinction between him and the eminent man; and Shakespeare *does exactly the same thing*. As Melsome emphasizes, it is remarkable enough that two men, contemporaries but unknown to each other, should pick out this one verse, in Ecclesiastes, of all the verses in the Bible; but it is even more remarkable that both of them should deliberately extend the teaching of the parable to embrace the *ordinary* man. That, of course, could not be accounted for by mere coincidence, and the only explanation must be that Francis Bacon and the author of "Shakespeare" were the same person, unless it can be shown that there was collaboration or "borrowing" the one from the other, which however is not possible. When the "Shakespeare" First Folio was published, in 1623, Will Shakspere had been dead seven years. Marlowe had been dead thirty years, or, even if still alive, would, according to Mr. Hoffman, have been abroad out of reach in Italy. Francis Bacon was then alive and, that same year 1623, published his "De Augmentis" at least twenty-six days before the "Shakespeare" Folio appeared, and while the Folio manuscripts were still in the printers' hands. But, there is no evidence that either Marlowe or Will Shakspere was ever seriously engaged in the realms of philosophy and poetry; whereas, there is overwhelming evidence that Francis Bacon was both profound philosopher and supreme poet.

THAT MASONIC LOST WORD

by

GEORGE V. TUDHOPE

Author of *Bacon Masonry*

The mysteries of Freemasonry, and particularly the meaning of that Masonic Lost Word, cannot be correctly understood or explained until a number of statements recorded in the Rituals and Monitors of the Masonic Order are correctly interpreted. The following questions are among those which must be answered correctly; each answer in complete harmony with the others and combine to give a true picture of that Masonic Lost Word.

1. How has Freemasonry subsisted from time immemorial?
2. What is the Divine plan?
3. How was Freemasonry designed to imitate the Divine plan?
4. What makes Freemasonry eternal?
5. What is the name and meaning of that Lost Word?
6. What is the allegorical meaning of the raising of the Master?

1. SUBSISTED FROM TIME IMMEMORIAL

The statement that Freemasonry is "ancient, as having subsisted from time immemorial" is extremely significant. This means that Freemasonry existed before man had a memory, or any of his five human senses. It began at the time of creation. Can this claim be substantiated?

The Supreme Architect of the universe, on the first day of creation, said: "Let there be light; and there was light." Since the sun, moon and stars were not created until four days later, the phrase must have actually meant, let there be knowledge; let there be memory.

Thus, on the first day of creation the first seeds of memory, or knowledge and wisdom, were planted, and Masonry was born. Man, with these attributes, became a builder and laid the first cornerstone of the greatest of all temples: the temple of the mind. This accounts for the Masonic allegorical story of the building of King Solomon's Temple. It also accounts for the Biblical and Masonic words "Let there be light" for this not only endowed man with memory, the ability to have and to hold knowledge and wisdom, but also to be a *builder* of memory. The first human builder, and the first symbolic Mason from whom Freemasonry sprang. On this basis Freemasonry can truthfully and logically claim to be "ancient, as having subsisted from time immemorial."

2. THE DIVINE WORD

Many ages must have passed before this first humble mason acquired more than a minimum desire for knowledge, or a wish to be serviceable to his fellow creatures. But such a time did come with the advent of the ancient fables, which represent his first attempt to pass his knowledge, or stored memory, along to others. It should be remembered that these fables were old before writing was invented; thus they were more ancient than the sacred scriptures.

A careful study of these ancient fables is extremely important to the Mason for they reveal much about the mysteries of Freemasonry, including the meaning of that Divine Word.

Francis Bacon (1561-1626) in his celebrated treatise, entitled "The Wisdom of the Ancients", probably gave the most accurate interpretation to date of these early fables. It is claimed by Basil Montague and generally accepted that no one has pierced deeper into their meaning or is better acquainted with their beauties than Francis Bacon; also that there have been very few books published in any nation which deserved or met more general applause, or any likely to retain it longer, than his book, "The Wisdom of the Ancients". Bacon claimed in his "Wisdom of the Ancients" that in the first ages, all things were full of fables; that the understanding of men in those times was rude and almost incapable of drawing fine or delicate distinctions, that many fables were so full of monstrosities he wondered how such ideas could ever by hatched in the brain of man. Yet he said: that they were worthy to be taken as a thing grave and sober, free from all vanity, profitable, and *necessary to all science.* It is through Bacon's interpretation of these ancient fables in "Wisdom of the Ancients", and "His Great Instauration", that the true name and meaning of that Masonic Lost Word is found. In the fable "Pan or Nature", as he called it, he states that there was a fraternity of Pan, or Nature. This fable becomes highly significant as we pierce deeper. Here are a few pertinent extracts from his works which must be carefully considered in relation to the Masonic mysteries.

Bacon has said, "And thus much concerning the Fraternity of Pan with the Destinies ....Pan the God of Hunters.....Motion and progress is nothing else but a Hunting, Arts and Sciences have their works; and human councils their ends which they earnestly hunt after... Pan, as his name imports, represents and lays open all things in nature ....either he came from Mercury, that is the Word of God....or else from the confused seeds of things. He further says in his *Advancement of Learning* under the heading "Pan or Nature,"—"This fable is, perhaps, the noblest of all antiquity, and pregnant with the mysteries and secrets of nature. Pan, as the name imports, represents the universe, about whose origin there are two opinions; *viz.*, that it either sprung from Mercury, that is, the Divine Word, according to the Scriptures and philosophical divines; or from the confused seeds of things....For this Pan, or universal nature of things, which we view and contemplate had its origin from the Divine Word, and confused matter, first created by God himself."

3. DESIGN TO IMITATE THE DIVINE WORD

Reviewing Bacon's interpretation of Pan, we find it is obvious that he believed that in those early times there was a fraternity called Pan, or Nature, that it had the desire to find all things concealed in universal nature, and its goal was to search for the arts and sciences. This Pan or universal nature is represented by the Divine Word, the confused matter first created by God himself. If we substitute the words Speculative Freemasonry for the words "Fraternity of Pan or Nature" we reveal the true meaning of the original intent and purpose of Freemasonry. By substituting, we can say that Speculative Freemasonry, has as its goal to search for the arts and sciences, to find all things in universal nature. And that Freemasonry, or universal nature, is represented by the Divine Word, or the confused matter first created by God himself. Speculative Freemasons are thus represented as the hunters for truths in nature with which to build the temple of memory —wisdom. Bacon's explanation of the Divine Word included all celestial and terrestrial matter created in the beginning. The Divine Word of the Fraternity of Pan or Nature is the same as the Lost Word of Speculative Freemasonry.

4. FREE MASONRY IS ETERNAL

In Freemasonry we are taught that the Lost Word may be found in future ages. By the use of the word *may* there is a doubt expressed whether human inquiry can reach it. Bacon expressed the same thought by these words, "The work which God worketh from beginning to end, or the summary law of nature, we doubt whether human inquiry can reach it." Bacon's Fraternity of Pan or Nature with its Divine Word is parallel to the Fraternity of Freemasonry with its Lost Word; since both express a doubt that all of that concealed in universal nature can ever be searched out, Freemasonry must therefore be *eternal*. Some may hesitate to believe that Freemasonry subsisted from the time before the memory of man, the time of creation, but they should not doubt that it did subsist from the time of the ancient fables, the time of the Fraternity of Pan, and represents the first Fraternity which had for its goal that Divine Word.

Here is an interesting translation of Virgil (70-19 B.C.) made by Bacon. It reaffirms the contention that the seeds of memory were sown at the time of the first Mason builder's birth.

> For rich-vein'd Orpheus sweetly did rehearse
> How that the seeds of fire, air, water, earth,
> Were all pact in the vast void universe:
> And how from these, as firstlings, all had birth,
> And how the body of this orbic frame,
> From tender infancy so big became.

This verse sets forth the belief that all things sprang from the first seeds of the elements, that these seeds grew from tender infancy to the greatness of the world to-day. This includes the seeds of memory, art and sciences, and all good things for the human race. The search for

these is the sublime goal of Freemasonry. Further, this Fraternity of Pan or Nature, must have believed in evolution and had as its destiny or goal the nurturing of the seeds of all things to the end that better fruit might be had for the good of all creatures. The Fraternity of Freemasonry belief in evolution is indicated by its example of how the Order of Architecture evolved from those who planted trees on end, and then laid others across to support a covering. Also the destiny or goal of Freemasonry is the same as that of the Fraternity of Pan, and is so expressed by the following Masonic words.

> "He that will so demean himself as not to be endeavouring to add to the common stock of knowledge and understanding, may be deemed a drone in the hive of nature, a useless member of society, and unworthy of our protection as Masons."

Bacon was one of the most learned men of his time. He sought knowledge in the Sacred Scriptures as well as in the "Wisdom of the Ancients". Many believed that he was the chief editor of the Authorized King James Version of the Holy Bible (1611). In a *Vulgate* Bible, 1609-1610, this statement is made: "This version is praised by no less an authority than Bacon.": thus establishing him as a great authority in Sacred Scriptures (see introduction, page 6, of the Holy Bible published by D. & J. Sadler, and Co., 31 Barclay Street, New York). In his writings, Bacon quoted more often from that celebrated builder King Solomon, than from any other person mentioned in the Bible. One of the quotations used by Bacon connects the Divine Word of the Fraternity Pan direct with King Solomon. Bacon said: "He (Solomon) reaps and makes claim to himself of nothing; for so he saith expressly, *The Glory of God is to conceal a thing, but the Glory of a King is to find it out*, as if according to that innocent and affectionate play of *Children* the Divine Majesty took delight to hide his works, to the end to have them found out; and as if Kings could not obtain a greater Honor than to be God's play-fellows in that game; especially considering the great command they have of wits and means, whereby the investigation of all things may be perfected."

5. THE NAME AND MEANING OF THAT LOST WORD

We are taught that Freemasonry was designed to imitate the Divine plan. Bacon revealed the meaning of the Divine plan by these words:

"The Divine Majesty took delight to hide his works, to the end to have them found out." It should be noted that Bacon's quotation from Solomon's 25th proverb is slightly different from that used in the Vulgate Bible, published before the James version. The Vulgate has it thus, "It is the glory of God to conceal the word." Here we have definitely the *"word"* which is the same as the Divine Word, and means all things concealed in nature. From Bacon's interpretation of Solomon's 25th proverb, one sees that he must have considered the real meaning of *word* as the Divine word and the Divine plan; that he felt the meaning of that *word* had been lost since the time of the Fraternity of Pan. Freemasonry informs us that there once existed a *Word* of

surpassing value, claiming profound veneration, that this Word was known to but few, that it was at length lost, and that a temporary substitute for it was adopted. Thus to imitate the Divine plan, the meaning and name of that ancient Divine Word were introduced into Freemasonry as the Lost Word. Bacon indicates that he considered himself the last possessor of the name and meaning of that mystic Word, in his "An Essay on Death." This essay on his own death gave the name of that Word, which he indicated would be completely lost at his death. It said:

> "The night was even now; but the name is lost: It is not now late, but early. Mine eyes began to discharge their watch, and compound with this fleshly weakness for a time of perpetual rest; and I shall presently be as happy for a few hours as I had died the first hour I was born."

He says, "that name is lost" which means the name of that *Word* is lost.

He says, "the night was even now", which means that Bacon is dead and the name of that Word is lost. By the use of the word "night" he literally shows that the light has gone, meaning that all the light or knowledge accumulated in his memory is gone. This "light" included the name of the Divine Word which he cunningly reveals as meaning light. By his death, that Word, called Light, is lost. Since there is no word in the English language that more completely encompasses the meaning of that Word as explained by Bacon, then one must accept the name of that Lost Word as *light*, and its meaning as all that which the Supreme Architect of the Universe concealed in nature in the beginning and commanded his children to search it out by the words "Let there be Light." Thus through Bacon, the true name and meaning of that Masonic Lost Word is found.

The pontiffs of Rome used that mystic WORD very early as the basis for their claim to supremacy over all other bishops and patriarchs. This claim of the Roman pontiffs was based on the grounds, that the church at Rome had been founded by St. Peter himself, the first bishop of that capital, to whom Christ had given the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and had further invested him with superlative authority as a teacher and interpreter of the WORD by the commission, "Feed my sheep;—Feed my Lambs," thus giving into his charge the entire flock of the Church. This authority and preeminence conferred by the great Head of the Church upon Peter was held to be transmitted to his successor in the holy office. (See P.V.N. Myers, AM., "General History", published by Ginn & Company, Boston U.S.A. and London, 1893, page 415.) The church of Rome used that WORD and twisted its meaning to give it full power over all human beings everywhere. Freemasons claim that the Word is lost and may be found in future ages.* Bacon reveals clearly the true name and meaning of that Divine Word and placed it as the highest goal that can be striven for by any people. It is "the wing with which we fly to heaven",

*For further information see *Bacon Masonry* by George V. Tudhope.

and truly "the key to the kingdom of heaven." In his works, Bacon laid down the foundation for searching out all that had been concealed in *Universal Nature,* and charged his followers not to found any sect or particular doctrine, but to fix an extensive world-wide basis for their service of human nature. Bacon believed and taught that nature is God's law upon his creatures, and that learning softens the barbarity and fierceness of men's minds. He sought to raise the level of learning and understanding among all human beings by the development of the arts and sciences. Thus they would also raise their morals to such a high level that "Peace on earth, good will toward men" would actually be attained. This method of accomplishing such an end could not be openly promoted or advocated in Bacon's time without entailing great danger. Therefore such ideals were concealed allegorically in the ritual of his secret orders.

6. MEANING OF "RAISING THE MASTER"

Bacon's works written under his own name are generally listed under the title of *Great Instauration.* The word "instauration" means, specifically, "a restoration after decay." It is a very significant fact that the greatest act in Freemasonry means a restoration after decay and is a direct and most perfect allegory of Francis Bacon's life work, *Great Instauration.* This great act is the climax of the whole Masonic system. It is an allegory that depicts a restoration after decay, in which that Lost Word is a sublime part. Bacon's great instauration, meaning a restoration after decay, and the Masonic allegory of restoration after decay thus are synonymous terms; they each have the same meaning—restoration after decay of all the Supreme Artificer left upon his trestle board, all that was buried in universal nature in the beginning. This reveals the most logical reason for this great act in Freemasonry.

It is my strongest conviction that Masonic students and researchers have been walking a treadmill that leads nowhere in their search for the true origin of Freemasonry and its original intent and purpose. I believe that until some writer presents more logical answers to the Masonic questions above, we must consider Francis Bacon is the only one to have furnished the correct answer to the above questions and therefore must be considered the true Father of Modern Speculative Freemasonry.†

Bacon Masonry $3.50. *That Masonic Lost Word* 25c. 6 copies $1.00. Obtainable direct from the author: George V. Tudhope 4187 Manila Avenue, Oakland 9, California, U.S.A.

BACON'S INSTRUMENTS AS AIDS TO THE SENSE OF SIGHT

By Robert R. Riegle

In Aphorism 121 of the first book of *Novum Organum* Francis Bacon says:

"that at first and for a time I am seeking for experiments of light, not for experiments of fruit; following therein, as I have often said, the example of the divine creation; which on the first day produced light only, and assigned to it alone one entire day, nor mixed up with it on that day any material work.

To suppose therefore that things like these are of no use is the same as to suppose that light is of no use, because it is not a thing solid or material. And the truth is that the knowledge of simple natures well examined and defined is as light; it gives entrance to all the secrets of nature's workship, and virtually includes and draws after it whole bands and troops of works, and opens to us the sources of the noblest axioms; and yet in itself it is of no great use. So also the letters of the alphabet in themselves and apart have no use or meaning, yet they are the subject matter for the composition and apparatus of all discourse. So again the seeds of things are of much latent virtue, and yet of no use except in their development. And the scattered rays of light itself, until they are made to converge, can impart none of their benefit".

From the above aphorism we learn that Bacon proposed as his first project the study of the nature of light by means of experiments. *But where are these experiments?* In the *New Atlantis* he devotes several pages to lenses, perspective houses, and light and shadows; but he reveals no experiments. In a paper, *Topics of Inquiry Respecting Light and Luminous Matter*, Bacon lists twelve topics that should be tried. In the *Sylva Sylvarum* he demonstrates examples of sight, but the illustrations given were apparently known at that time. Since we are unable to locate in Bacon's works any completed experiments on light, we must come to one of two conclusions; either he never produced any experiments, or he did complete them but transmitted them in such a concealed manner that they have not been discovered. My esteem for Francis Bacon is such that I cannot accept the former conclusion. To me it is incredible that a man who is considered to have possessed one of the greatest minds of all mankind, who is called the Father of Modern Thought and Science, and who devoted over forty years of his life to the development of a new method of searching after truth should have failed at the very outset of his purpose to present to us the first fruits of his design.

We find in some of Bacon's works indications that he planned to present parts of his plan in a secret manner as through a veil. He indicates his purpose of withholding part of the truth and of publishing in a manner not within the capacity of all. Because of the fear of persecution by torture, death and excommunication, or the destruction of their works, other scientists have handed down to us their scientific experiments in an enigmatic manner *e.g.*, mirror writing, microscopic

writing, ciphers, etc. From a study of Bacon's life and works we know that he was well acquainted with methods of concealment and that he made frequent use of them in his works and in governmental affairs. So it should not be difficult for us to assume that he transmitted to us by means of secret writing parts of his philosophy, not only for the sake of secrecy in itself, but also as an integral part of his new method of searching for the truth.

It is my firm conviction that a vast part of this secret writing is made up of minute letters, numbers, and other characters imbedded in the ink that forms the margin lines, emblems, engravings, and the printed word itself. Incredible as it may seem, these hidden characters are there. For eight years, using various combinations of lenses, I have been observing them, in original editions of Bacon's work, as well as in a facsimile of the 1623 Folio. These latent configurations represent the elements that are found in the mass of matter that makes up Bacon's world. They are comparable to the elements that are found in the world that surrounds us. For once we have discovered the elements in nature and have learned to join them or separate them, we shall have such power over nature as to command and control her and thereby interpret her. The same can be said of these latent characters found in the ink of Bacon's original works. They are the elements and seeds of Bacon's discourse. Once we have discovered the means of extracting these minute configurations and have learned how to join them or separate them, we shall be able to interpret Bacon's methods of secret writing. Since we are aware of the existence of these latent configurations, we must assign as our first task the construction of instruments that will aid us in extracting them. The following quotations from the *Novum Organum* should suggest to us the kinds of instruments that should be developed:—

"Our steps must be guided by a clue, and the whole way from the very first perception of the senses must be laid out upon a sure plan".

"————before we can reach the remote and more hidden parts of nature, it is necessary that a more perfect use and application of the human mind and intellect be introduced."

"I, on the contrary, dwelling purely and constantly among the facts of nature, withdraw my intellect from them no further than may suffice to let the images and rays of natural objects meet in a point, as they do in the sense of vision".

"For certain it is that the senses deceive; but at the same time they supply the means of discovering their errors; only the errors are here, the means of discovery are to seek".

"The sense fails in two ways. Sometimes it gives no information, sometimes it gives false information. For first there are very many means which escape the senses even when they are best disposed and no way obstructed by reason either of the subtlety of the whole body, or the minuteness of the parts, or distance of place, or slowness or swiftness of motion, or familiarity of the object or other causes".

"For I admit nothing but on the faith of eyes, or at least of careful and severe examination".

"Such then are the provisions I make for finding the genuine light of nature and kindling and bringing it to bear."
"I open and lay out a new and certain path for the mind to proceed in, starting directly from the simple sensuous perception".
"But by far the greatest hinderance and aberration of the human understanding proceeds from the dullness, incompetency, and deception of the senses; in that things that strike the sense outweigh things which do not immediately strike it though they be more important. Hence, it is that speculation ceases where sight ceases; insomuch that of things invisible there is little or no observation. Hence, all the workings of the spirit enclosed in tangible bodies lies hid and un-observed of men. So also all the more subtle changes of form in the coarser substances is in like manner unobserved. And yet unless these two just mentioned be searched and brought to light, nothing great can be achieved in nature, as far as the production of works is concerned".
"For seeing that every natural action depends on things infinitely small or at least too small to strike the sense no one can hope to govern or change nature until he has duly comprehended and observed them".
"Now of all the senses it is manifest that sight has the chief office in giving information. This is the sense therefore for which we must chiefly endeavour to procure aid. Now the aids to the sight are of three kinds; it may be enabled to perceive objects that are not visible; to perceive them further off; and to perceive them more exactly and distinctly".
"The knowledge of man (hitherto) hath been determined by view or sight; so that whatsoever is invisible, either in respect of the 'Fineness of the Body' itself; or the smallness of the Parts, or the subtleties of the motion; is little inquired and yet these be the things that govern nature principally, and without which, you cannot make any true analysis and Induction of the proceedings of Nature".

From the above quotations and from our knowledge of lenses we can readily conclude that, as helps to the understanding, optical instruments are of the utmost importance in the development of Bacon's method. We are also aware that curved pieces of glass are a means of studying the behaviour of light. Since our first task is experiments touching light, let us develop lenses to help us on our way following the directions Bacon presents to us in the first aphorism of the second book of the *Novum Organum* which are as follows:—

> "On a given body to generate and superinduce a new nature or new natures, is the work and aim of Human Power. Of a given nature to discover the form, or true specific difference, or nature-engendering natrue, or source of emanation (for these are the terms which come nearest to a description of the thing), is the work and aim of Human Knowledge. Subordinate to these primary works are two others that are of secondary and inferior mark; to the former, the transformation of concrete bodies, so far as this is possible; to the latter, the discovery, in every case of generation and motion, of the 'latent process' carried on from the manifest

efficient and the manifest material to the form which is engendered and in like manner the discovery of the 'latent configuration' of bodies at rest and not in motion".

From the knowledge extant during Bacon's time we know that the chief ingredient used in the making of glass is sand. So through the processes of heating, the adding of some material or materials, the proper stirring to rid the molten mass of bubbles of air and impurities, the proper cooling, rolling, etc., we have transformed the concrete body of sand into a mass of flat glass, which has a transparent nature.

We know that burning glasses were in use before Bacon's time, so let our first experiment be the construction of one. Now a thick flat piece of glass produces no heat whatsoever, so it is our purpose to generate and superinduce upon the transparent glass the nature of heat. Through the processes of grinding and polishing we finally construct a burning glass which is also a double convex lense. When we let the rays of the sun pass through this lens, we find that when the lens is placed at a certain distance from a piece of wood, the wood will catch fire showing that the nature of heat has been produced. When we observe objects through this burning glass, we discover that the objects have expanded. Now the process by which heat was produced is hidden, so we ask ourselves by what means or from what source was this heat formed. By further experiments we discover that the rays from the sun, when they enter the glass, are bent, and when they emerge from the glass, they converge, and at the point of convergence, heat is produced, thus revealing to us the latent process. With the aid of instruments and mathematics we can construct the angles of incidence, refraction and reflection, as well as the distance to the focal point, etc., thereby revealing by means of a convex lens the latent configurations embodied in the formation of the natures of heat and expansion.

In Aphorism two we learn that "true knowledge is knowledge by causes". And causes again are not improperly distributed into four kinds; the material, the efficient, the formal, and the final. We also learn in this aphorism Bacon's definition of "Forms".
"For though in nature nothing really exists besides individual bodies performing pure individual acts according to a fixed law, yet in philosophy this very law and the investigation, discovery, and explanation of it, is the foundation as well of knowledge as of operation. And it is this law, with its causes, that I mean when I speak of Forms".

With our experiments touching the natures of heat and expansion, we find the material cause is the transparent glass. The efficient cause is the carrier of the form—the agency which is used to produce the effect. This agency is light. The formal cause is the discovery, investigation, and explanation of the principles involved in the behaviour of light before it enters the convex lens; during its passage through the lens and after it emerges from the lens to its convergence at, as well as its divergence from, the focal point. All the above principles involve the form of heat. So whenever this form is present, the nature of heat is present. If the nature of heat is absent so is the

form. Utilizing the axioms derived from the above experiments, we continue our investigations—varying the curvatures and sizes of other lenses—in an attempt to arrive at the ultimate intensity of heat obtained by means of lenses. This is the final cause. Bacon doubts whether man is capable of arriving at the final cause. "Nature to be commanded must be obeyed" is one of his aphorisms. Through the knowledge of the principles by which light passes through a curved transparent object, we are able to command the nature of light and thereby develop the necessary requirements to produce heat. Heat is an expansive motion; cold, a contractual motion. By changing the curvature of a circular piece of glass so that the centre is thinner than the edges we form a concave lense that has the motion of contraction. Through the principles involved we learn further axioms touching the behaviour of light.

After Bacon presents to us the first vintage of his method, which is the nature of heat, he proceeds to list nine helps to the understanding. Of these nine helps he treats only of the first,—"Prerogative Instances", twenty-seven in number. The first is "Solitary Instances". Here again he is following the order of the divine creation, for the "Solitary Instances" are a study of light as it passes through a prism, or a crystal etc., and breaks into the various colors. In the second place he puts "Migratory Instances". "They are those in which the nature in question is in the process of being produced when it did not previously exist or on the other hand of disappearing when it existed before". The example he gave was the investigation of whiteness. "We know that two bodies, both transparent, but in a greater or less degree do when mingled in small portions together exhibit whiteness, through the unequal refraction of the rays of light". If the reader is familiar with a telescope or a microscope, he will recall that in the process of focusing the instrument there is a time when whiteness is produced.

Bacon places the sixteenth instance through the twentieth instance under one general name which he calls "Instances of the Lamp, or the First Information". They are those which aid the senses. Through all of them can be traced the development of lenses or optical instruments. The Sixteenth instance is "Instances of the Door or Gate", a name which he gives to instances which aid the immediate action of the senses, and since sight has the chief office in giving information, it is for that sense that we must chiefly endeavour to give aid.

In this instance he proceeds to extol the virtues of the microscope but concludes with its incompetency in that it is available for minutiæ alone. Other glasses should be invented so that their uses could be extended to larger bodies or to the minutiæ of larger bodies "so that the texture of a linen cloth could be seen like a network, and thus the latent minutiæ and inequalities in gems, liquors, wine, blood, wounds, etc., could be distinguished. Great advantages might doubtless be derived from the discovery of such inventions". He next praises the wonder of the telescope in its ability to discover the workings of the heavens but regards it with suspicion "chiefly because the experiment stops with these

few discoveries, and many others equally worthy of investigation are not discovered by the same means". From the above instances, we can readily see that he proposes, as helps to the understanding, other optical instruments, as well as further discoveries with the instruments then in use.

Among the "Prerogative Instances" Bacon puts in the twenty-fourth place "Instances of Strife", which he calls "Instances of Predominance". They indicate the predominance and subjection of virtues. He then propounds the principal kinds of motions or active virtues. Motion plays a most important part in Bacon's scheme of things, so it is imperative that we make a study of these active virtues. During the development of lenses our investigation was not confined solely to experiments touching heat. Through a study of the reactions upon printed matter from various types of lenses we become aware of the similarity between the apparent motions of this printed matter and the motions found in nature. For examples, heat and cold, expansion and contraction; and attraction and repulsion. In the fable "Cupid" from the *Wisdom of the Ancients* we learn that the source of things is the "appetite or instinct of primal matter; or to speak more plainly the natural motion of the atom" which is "that impulse of desire impressed by God upon the primary particles of matter which makes them come together and which by multiplication and repetition produces all the variety of nature". In his article on "Principles and Origins, according to the Fables of Cupid and Coelum" we learn that "the body of the atom are the elements of all bodies, and in the motion and virtue of the atom are the beginnings of all motions and virtues".

Now, if we are able to join all the motions into a compound and in their just proportions, we shall arrive at the natural motion of the atom. Our experiments then should be towards that goal, although as Bacon says, it is doubtful whether man can attain it. Let us attempt experiments by means of lenses to observe motions that resemble motions in nature. But first let me quote from Bacon's works to qualify the uses of resemblances.

"——in the pursuit towards similitude of God's goodness or love (which is one thing for love is nothing else but goodness put in motion or applied), neither man nor spirit hath transgressed or shall transgress". *Valerius Terminus.*

"But as to the goodness of God, there is no danger in contending or advancing towards a similitude thereof as that which is open and propounded to our imitation". *Valerius Terminus.*

"The senses discover natural things but darken and shut up divine. And this appeareth sufficiently in that there is no invention of knowledge but by Similitudes". *Valerius Terminus.*

"Men's labours, therefore, should be turned to the investigation and observation of the resemblances and analogies of things as well in wholes as in parts. For these it is that detect the unity of nature, and lay a foundation for the constitution of the sciences". *Novum Organum.*

"And for myself, I found that I was constructed more for the contemplation of truth than for anything else, as having a mind agile

enough to recognize the resemblance of things (and this is the most important), and sufficiently steadfast and eager to observe the refinements of their diversity". *Interpretation of Nature-Proem.*

In the *Sylva Sylvarum* Bacon says, "It is certain, that of all the Powers in Nature, Heat is the chief, both in the Frame of Nature, and in the works of Art". Bacon's definition of Heat is as follows: "Heat is a motion, expansive, restrained, and acting in its strife upon the smaller particles of bodies. While it expands all ways, it has at the same time an inclination upwards. It is not sluggish, but hurried and with violence. If, in any natural body you can excite a dilating or expanding motion, and can so repress this motion and turn it back upon itself that the dilation shall not proceed equably but have its way in one part and be counter-acted in another you will undoubtedly generate heat".

I have placed on a printed page before me a double convex lens. As I raise and lower the lens the apparent motion of the print resembles the motion of heat as described above. Using a double concave lens, I observe that the apparent motion of the print resembles the contractible motion of cold.

The eighth motion which Bacon describes is the motion of the Lesser Congregation, by which homogeneous parts in a body separate themselves from the heterogeneous, and combine together. "The binding of the motion of Lesser congregation which is caused by the external motion, is most conspicuous in the shaking of bodies to prevent putrefaction. For all putrefaction depends on the assembly together of homogeneous parts; whence there gradually ensues the corruption of the old form, as they call it, and the generation of a new. For putrefaction, which paves the way for the generation of a new form, is preceded by the dissolution of the old."

I have placed a small convex lens over a letter "a" in the 1635 Edition of the *Sylva Sylvarum.* As the lens is slightly raised and lowered, there is no apparent change in the letter, but when the lens is raised to the focal point, dissolution of the letter has occurred, and when we observe what remains, we find that the homogeneous parts have joined together to form small letters and figures—N, C, 2, 9, 1, A, 4, etc., and the rudiments of others that cannot be discerned with the lens used.

"I must not omit that meeting of the parts of bodies, which is the chief cause of induration and dessication. For when the spirit, or moisture turned to spirit, has escaped from some porous body (as wood, bone, parchment, and the like), then the grosser parts are with stronger effort drawn and collected together; whence ensues induration or dessication".

Since cold is a means of effecting induration, let us use a double concave lens to produce the motion of cold and place it upon the cross-hatching in the engraved portrait of Bacon found at the beginning of the *Sylva Sylvarum.* As we raise the lens, the lines are drawn more closely together permitting the spirit to escape. As we look closely at the grosser parts which remain, we can observe figures and letters,

A, R, C, 5, 8, 7, 2, etc. Heat is another means of effecting induration or dessication. By raising a convex lens up to the focal point, we have expanded the apparent spirits and moistures found in the lines and interstices to their maxim. As the lens is raised higher, the spirits escape and the lines have come closer together making a smaller object. Here again can be detected letters and figures but not so clearly as induration by cold. By means of lenses we have imitated the motions of putrefaction and induration. We can imitate the motions of heat and cold, expansion and contraction, the rise and fall of the tides, the attraction and repulsion of the magnet, the motion towards the center as well as towards the circumference of the heavens. When a convex lens is raised, the motion effected resembles the growth of a plant outwards. We can imitate the pulse and heart beat in animals, as well as the motion of spirits in animate and inanimate objects.

The flights of missiles, darts, or arrows have two motions. As they move forward, they revolve. Light as it passes from a convex lens revolves as it moves forward.

The reflection from the rays of a lens according to its position to an object resembles the reflexion of the heat from the sun in its relation to the earth. As a convex lens is moved across a line of print the apparent retrogressive motion of the line of print resembles the retrogressive motion of the heavens.

In the regulation of motion, Bacon says that the upright cone in alembics helps the condensation of vapours; the inverted cone in receivers helps the draining off of the dregs of sugar. To study its behaviour I made a cone of clear plastic approximately two inches in diameter at the base and two inches in height and placed it upon the printed page, first with the vertex towards the top of the page. As I raised the cone, the print rose, and became smaller. When I inverted the cone the print appeared to be left at the bottom. The actions resembled those of condensation and draining. The effects also resemble the motions of distillation and straining.

Many more examples could be given, but enough have been set down to show how light as it passes through curved pieces of glass creates motions that resemble those in nature. Now, if the proper proportions of convexity, concavity, and conical were joined together in the formation of a lens, we should come close to the apparent motion of the atom. The shape of the lens it appears to me, would be parabolical with a concavity at the bottom. In the "Plan of the Work" Bacon says that before we can proceed to the development of the philosophy itself, we must, partly for present use, "first set forth examples of inquiry and invention according to my method, exhibited by anticipation in some particular subjects; choosing such subjects as are at once the most noble in themselves among those under inquiry, and most different one from another; that there may be an example in every kind. I do not speak of those examples which are joined to the several precepts and rules by way of illustration (for of these I have given plenty in the second part of the work); but I mean actual types and models, by which the entire process of the mind and the whole fabric and order of inven-

tion from the beginning to the end, in certain subjects, and those various and remarkable should be set as it were before the eyes. For I remember that in the mathematics it is easy to follow the demonstration when you have a machine beside you; whereas without that help all appears involved and more subtle than it really is. To examples of this kind,—being in fact, nothing more than an application of the second part in detail and at large—the fourth part of the work is devoted."

As I interpret the above quotation, the fourth part of the *Great Instauration* is to be a model of Bacon's new method. In the study of geometry there is usually an example together with diagrams and methods illustrating the procedure to follow in solving problems of a similar kind. Before we can attempt a development of Bacon's New Philosophy, we must first discover and develop in its entirety his model, which is a means of training and preparing the mind for the advancement of the New Philosophy, as well as discovering how far Bacon had developed it. It appears to me that a portion of his model rests in the bringing forth by means of lenses the latent configurations—letters, figures, etc.—that are imbedded in the print and paper of the original editions of Bacon's works. The latent configurations are there; the instruments to read them clearly must be discovered.

The first title in Bacon's Natural and Experimental History for the Foundation of Philosophy is the "History of the Winds," which is part of the third division of the Great Instauration, as well as a part of the fourth division. Here we observe the following facts:—

"Ventilation is produced or arises naturally in houses where there is a thorough draught, the air going in at one side and out at another. But it is done more effectually if the air enters from different sides, meets in angles, and has a common outlet at the meeting place. Arched and circular dining rooms are cooler; likewise, because the air which is stirred in them is reflected in all directions. Curved porticoes are better than straight ones; for a wind in a straight line through it is not confined but has a free outlet yet does not make the air so unequal, voluminous, and undulatory as the meeting in angles, the windings about the collections in a round space, and the like". Please observe the uses of concavity and convexity.

Wind is air in motion, nothing else. We observe the motion of wind in the motion of water as in a mirror. Great winds are inundations of air, the resemblance of which we see in inundations of water, both arising from an increase of quantity. The various degrees of heat produce various strengths of the winds. The contraction of air by cold after it has been dilated likewise creates winds. The intensity of the winds varies according to the coldness of the air. The three lines of motions of the winds are upwards, downwards, and sideways. Winds have three local origins; they spring up from the earth, are driven down from above, or stirred up in the body of the air. Through the use of concaves or convex lenses or their combinations we can imitate the nature of the wind by moving them upwards and downwards or sideways.

After Bacon has revealed his inquiries concerning the motions

of the winds in nature, he employs the next part of the "History" to the description of the "Motion of Winds in the Sails of Ships".

"1. The largest British ships (for I take them as my example) have four and sometimes five masts; all standing erect one behind the other in a straight line drawn through the centre of the vessel.

2. The names of these masts are; the mainmast in the centre, the foremast, the mizenmast (which is sometimes double), and the bowsprit.

8. The mainsails of the mainmast, foremast and bowsprit, are of a quadrangular or parallelogram shape; and the top and top-gallant-sails are somewhat sharpened and pointed; but in the mizenmast the top-sail is pointed and the mainsail triangular.

9. In a ship of 1100 tons, 112 feet long in the keel, and 40 feet wide in the hold, the mainsail of the mainmast was 42 feet deep and 87 feet wide.

10. The topsail of the same mast was 50 feet deep, 84 feet wide at the base, and 42 at the top.

11. The top-gallantsail was 27 feet deep 42 feet wide at the base, and 21 at the top.

12. The mainsail of the foremast was 40½ feet deep, and 72 feet wide.

13. The topsail was 46½ feet deep, 69 feet wide at the base, and 36 at the top.

14. The top-gallantsail was 24 feet deep, 36 feet wide at the base, and 18 at the top.

15. The mainsail of the mizenmast was, from the upper point of the yard-arm, 51 feet deep, its width where it is joined to the yard-arm, was 72 feet, the other part ending in a point.

16. The topsail was 30 feet deep, 57 feet wide at the base, and 30 at the top.

17. If there are two mizenmasts, the sails of the hindermost are about one fifth less than those of the foremast.

18. The mainsail of the bowsprit was 28½ feet deep, and 60 feet in width.

19. The topsail was 25½ feet deep, 60 feet wide at the base, and 30 at the top.

21. As every sail is stretched out straight at the top, and only fastened by the corners at the bottom, they must necessarily be all swollen out by the wind; especially towards the bottom where they are slackest.

22. The swell is much greater in the mainsails than in the rest; not only because they are of a parallelogram shape, and the others pointed; but also because the width of the yard-arm so far exceeds the width of the sides of the vessel, to which they are fastened. For

this makes them so slack as to present a great hold to the wind, so that in the large vessel here chosen as a model, the swell of the sail inwards in sailing before the wind may be as much as nine or ten feet.

23. From the same cause likewise all sails swollen by the wind become arched at the bottom, so that much of the wind must miss them. In the above mentioned vessel this arch is almost equal to the stature of a man.

28. In a ship sailing straight before the wind, the best and most commodious disposition of the sails is to hoist the two lower sails of the foremast (for there the motion has been stated to be most powerful) and also the topsail of the mainmast. For there will be space enough left below to allow the wind to fill the afore-mentioned sails of the foremast, without any considerable loss".

In parts twenty-one and twenty-two we see the uses of both convexity and concavity. In the description of the sails we find full measurements of things for the only time throughout his philosophical writings. Let us utilize these measurements presented to us together with the swell of the sails and the arch of the sails in the construction of lenses. From our natural history of optics we know that the convexity of some lenses is placed at the top. Let us take the swell of a sail, which is as much as nine or ten feet and place it upon a sketch of the top gallant sail of the main mast. The completed drawing reveals a figure parabolical in shape. With the aid of mathematics we can obtain the necessary thickness of the convex portion placed at the top of the topgallant sail to form a true parabola. The thickness in this instance is nine feet making a total depth of the lens-sail thirty-six feet. In all sails swollen by the wind the bottom becomes arched almost equal to the stature of a man. Let us assume this arch to be six feet and the swell of the sail ten feet. Now for every foot of swell the arch is raised six-tenths of a foot. Applying this ratio to the above top gallant sail, we find that the arch of the sail is $5\frac{4}{10}$ feet. Thus we have formed a parabolical sail-lens that has both convexity and concavity. Following the above procedure we can form parabolical lenses of all the sails—ten in number or twelve if the sails of the mizenmast are doubled, each one different in construction. The appropriate drawing shows a description of these sails drawn to scale. The reader will observe that the figures of some of these sails can be likened to the oddly shaped collar found in the Droeshout portrait of Shakespeare. Item 28 reveals that the most commodious disposition of the sails is the use of the two lower sails of the foremast and the top sail of the main mast. Since this is so, we can assume that lenses representing these sails would be the ones used most frequently. Our first task, therefore, should be to make lenses using dimensions proportionate to the dimensions of the above mentioned sails. This work calls for the aid of experts in the field of optics, for without their knowledge and skill, I doubt very much that the instruments can ever be constructed. I sent sketches of the two above mentioned sails—scale 1/64 inch equals one foot—to eight different optical companies in the United

States and three in Western Germany but was unsuccessful in acquiring any lenses. Their replies were the same. The cost of making such a lens or lenses would be very expensive, and modern methods of lens-making do not call for the use of parabolical shapes; therefore, their machines are not set up for such work. Using clear plastic, I attempted to construct several top and top gallant sail-lenses using the complete swell of the sails. The instances were negative because the full extent of the sails caused the completed lens to rise too near to a point, making the objects observed through it indistinguishable.

In item seven of his "Major Observations" Bacon says, "—it is of great importance that the sails should only have a moderate swell and extension. For, it they be stretched tight, they act as a wall to repel the wind, if they be slack, they make the impulse feeble". Accepting the above as a clue, I constructed other sails making the swell five to six feet. The results were lenses that had broader apexes making objects observed through them quite distinguishable. Unfortunately I am not a craftsman, so I haven't been successful in polishing the lenses to a perfect smoothness. There are too many aberrations for the observation of minuteness. Perhaps some one interested in my theory will be more successful.

It is interesting to note that on two occasions, Bacon compares optical instruments to ships. From "A Description of the Intellectual Globe",—"I have to congratulate both the industry of mechanics and the zeal and energy of certain learned men, that now of late by the help of optical instruments, as by skiffs and barks, they have opened a new commerce with the phenomena of the heavens; an undertaking which I regard as being both in the end and in the endeavour a thing noble and worthy of the human race."

From the *Novum Organum*: "Of the second kind are those other glasses discovered by the memorable efforts of Galileo, by the aid of which, as by boats or vessels, a nearer intercourse with the heavenly bodies can be opened and carried on."

In the "Plan of the Work" of the *Great Instauration* Bacon says: "'The sixth part of my work discloses and sets forth that philosophy which by the legitimate, chaste, and severe course of inquiry which I have explained and provided is at length developed and established. The completion, however, of this last part is a thing both above my strength and beyond my hopes. I have made a beginning of the work—a beginning as I hope not unimportant—the fortune of the human race will give the issue".

From the above quotation we are safe in assuming that Bacon did make a beginning of the sixth part of his *Instauration* but up to the present time it has not been found out. It is my belief that once we have developed the proper optical instruments, which, like boats or vessels, can circumnavigate his invisble world, we shall hold a commerce between the mind and the latent configurations found in Bacon's model of his new method, thereby revealing to us many things that have been hidden for three and a quarter centuries.

SHAKESPEARE'S SONNETS AND "MR. W. H."

by

R. J. A. Bunnett, F.S.A.

III

The Oxfordians lay much stress upon Sonnet 76:

"Why write I still all one E. VER. the same,
And keep invention in a noted weed,
That E. VERY word doth almost tell my name."

The name De Vere apparently originated from the village of Ver, near Bayeux, in Normandy.

Mrs. Stopes[1] suggests quite plausibly that the "happiness and eternity" promised in the Sonnets dedication reads very like a wedding wish, the eternity to be won by leaving progeny, and Colonel B. R. Ward[2] discovered in the Parish Register of Hackney the following entry:—

"William Hall and Margery Gryffyn were joyned in
Matrymonye on the 4th Aug. 1608."

The latter writer remarks what "more suitable wedding present for the bridegroom than the volume of sonnets," which opens with the lines:—

"From fairest creatures we desire increase
That thereby beauty's Rose might never die."

The bride was the daughter of Edward Gryffyn, a scrivener of Southwark, whose name frequently occurs in the Henslowe Papers[3] and who belonged to the same fraternity as Thorpe and Hall.

Sir Sidney Lee agreed that this is the William Hall of the Dedication, and that he might have been congratulated on the birth of a child in 1609.

The Reverend Walker Begley[4] decided that 'Mr. W. H.' was only just possibly William Herbert, Earl of Pembroke, but might easily as well be the Mr. W. Hall whom Lee championed.

Sir Edmund Chambers, as between the claims of Southampton and Herbert, inclines to the latter, but would prefer some person "unknown not necessarily great," or an aristocrat. He objected to Lee's theory on the grounds of "the commonness of the initials 'W. H.' and of the name Hall" and of the "Humour in the notion of Thorpe's dedicating the volume to a printer whom he had not employed."

Samuel Butler declared that the "engenderer of the Sonnets,

---

[1]Biography of "The Third Earl of Southampton."

[2]"The Mystery of 'Mr. W. H.' " 1923.

[3]Henslowe Philip (d. 1616). Theatrical Manager. His MS. Diary discovered at Dulwich College c.1790 throws much light upon the stage actors and plays of the period.

[4]"Is It Shakespeare?" by 'A Cambridge Graduate'. 1903.

whatever else he was, was not a man of rank;" and that the Sonnets appear to have been addressed to a young man whose Christian name "was certainly William, and whose surname seems to have been Hughes."

This Butler states, having dismissed Pembroke, Southampton, and the supposition that 'Mr. W. H.' was merely the person who procured the sonnets for Thorpe. The "impersonal theory being ordered out of court," we are left without any proposition as to whom he may have been except the very plausible conjecture of Tyrwhitt[1], endorsed by Malone, that he was a person named William Hughes, or Hewes, or Hews, as the name was very commonly spelt at the close of the 16th century.

Edward Malone, in his 1780 edition of the Poems of Shakespeare (a supplementary volume to Johnson and Steevens 1778 edition of the plays) remarked:— "Mr. Tyrwhitt has pointed out to me a line in the twentieth Sonnet, which inclines me to think that the initials 'W.H.' stand for William Hughes. Speaking of this person the poet says:—

"A man in hew, all Hews in his controlling,
Which steals men's eyes, and women's souls amazeth."

To this person whoever he was, one hundred and twenty[2] of the following sonnets are addressed. The remaining twenty-eight are to a lady." In the 1609 edition of the Sonnets the word 'Hews' is put in italics, and begins with a capital letter.

Lee interpreted the first line to mean, "a man in colour or complexion whose charms are so varied as to appear to give his countenance control of, or enable it to assume, all manner of fascinating hues or complexions."

The word 'hue', stated Thomas Tyler[3], in Shakespeare's time could be employed to indicate 'form' or 'appearance', and he quotes Spenser—"Fairy Queen", Bk.V, canto IX:—

"Then can it run away incontinent,
Being returned to his former hew."

Dr. G. H. Rendall[4] takes it for granted that this Sonnet was addressed to Southampton, and says "the fact that anyone can seriously suppose that William Shakespere, actor, could address the Earl in this strain, seems almost a record in literary credulity."

Dr. H. C. Beeching[5] suggested a plausible emendation, "A maiden in hue" for "a man in hue."

Mr. Gerald Massey[6] declared that in 'Hews' it was 'Ewes' which was aimed at by a *double entendre*, Ewe being a title of Essex. The earldom was that of Essex and Ewe. Mr. Massey takes the line to mean that Southampton's "comeliness and favour were far superior to those of Essex, thus giving him the upper hand at court."[7]

---

[1] *Tyrwhitt, Thomas* (1730-1786) Wrote amongst other works, 'Observations and Conjectures on some Passages of Shakespeare' (Anon) 1744.
[2] Corrected to "a hundred and twenty-six" in the 1794 edition.
[3] "Shakespeare's Sonnets." 1890.
[4] "Shakespeare's Sonnets and Edward de Vere." 1930.
[5] *Beeching H. C.* D. Litt. Miscellaneous writer; became Dean of Norwich.
[6] "The Secret Drama of Shakespeare's Sonnets" 1872. (re-written 1890).
[7] Articles in Baconiana, July 1906, and January 1907, support the Essex theory.

A writer in Blackwood (May, 1901) maintained that the Earl of Pembroke had a courtesy title, Lord Fitzhugh or Fitzhew, and his solution of the mystery was "A man in hew—the Lord Fitzhew—the Lord of all the sons of Hew—all the Hews." As the eldest son of an Earl, Herbert would actually have been known as 'Lord Herbert.'

It has also been suggested that 'Hews' is an anagram for Henry Wriothesley, Earl of Southampton, and besides that there was a William Hughes who took women's parts in Shakespeare's company.

Sir George Greenwood[1] mentions that Judge Stotsenburg[2] ascribes the authorship of the Sonnets to Sir Philip Sidney, and identifies the 'man in hue' with Sidney's bosom friend, Sir Edward Dyer. Alfred Dodd takes this sonnet as being addressed to Apollo as the god of Poetry and Eloquence and that the word 'Hue' here —'Passion,' 'Shape.' Apollo was the god of the sun...the 'eye' which rolls steadily in its orbit as it gazeth on the earth. As Bacon said:— "God's First Creature, Light." In "The Wisdom of the Ancients" (1609) Bacon explains that Dionysus, or Passion, "when grown up appeared with so effeminate a face that his sex seemed somewhat doubtful," and he interprets this as meaning that, "every passion appears of a doubtful sex, as having the strength of a man at first, but at last the impotence of a woman." Apollo was always represented as a tall, beardless youth with long curls. He had, moreover, in his amours the power of assuming various shapes.

* * * *

B. G. Theobald[3] has very ingeniously worked out a Baconian cipher in the Dedication. He is of opinion that Bacon must of necessity have supervised with the greatest care the title page, the dedication, the first and last pages, and indeed everything which could bear on cipher material. Mr. Theobald examined, he says, Lee's list of errors, and only in a single instance could these have any effect on the cipher signatures considered. Also it must not be forgotten, the writer states, that the seal of the Rosicrucian Fraternity, besides appearing twice in the Dedication, is embedded in the first page of text and again, in duplicate, on the last page.

Mr. Theobald uses three quite simple ciphers, which he designates S, R, and K, of which the first is the elementary one A=1, B=2, and the second is its reverse Z=1, and so forth; the third being slightly more complex A = 27, B=28, to IJ=35. Thereafter K=10, L=11.

Alfred Dodd states that 'W. H.' and 'T.T.' are correctly interpreted in an enfolded message in the last Sonnet. Both the 103rd and 104th sonnets deal with the same theme "Love's fire heats water; water cools not love," and the legend embodied in these appears to have been derived from a poem in the Anthology, then in the Palatine Library at Heidleberg, and now among the MSS. in the Vatican, by

[1] "The Shakespeare Problem Restated."
[2] "An Impartial Study of the Shakespeare Title."
[3] "Shake-speare's Sonnets Unmasked." 1929.

Marianus, a Greek poet of about 5th century B.C. Spenser says in the Fairy Queen, ii, canto X, st. 26,"Behold the boyling bathes at Cairbadon, which seeth with secret fire eternally."

* * * *

W. T. Smedley[1] held that Mr. W. H. was 'Shakespeare' himself, who was the only begetter of the Sonnets. He pictures Francis Bacon, when 'forty winters' had beseiged his brow, sitting down at his table, unmarried, childless, "Hilliard's portrait before him, with pen in hand, full of self-love, full of admiration for that beautiful youth on whose counterfeit presentment he is gazing. His intellectual triumphs pass in review before him, most of them known only to himself and that youth—his companion through life. That was the Francis Bacon who controlled him in all his comings and goings—his ideal whom he worshipped. If he could have a son like that boy!" And so he starts to write "from fairest creatures we desire increase." Smedley finds the key to the Sonnets in no. 62:— "Sin of self-love possesseth all mine eye.", but his glass shows him to be, "Beated and chopp'd with tann'd antiquity."

* * * *

The careers of Henry Wriothesley, Earl of Southampton, and William Herbert, Earl of Pembroke, show curious analogies; both were handsome, were much in the public eye, and had beautiful mothers[2]; both, moreover, were subjects of early negotiations for marriages. Southampton was a ward of Burghley, having lost his father when only eight years old, and his guardian was anxious that he should marry Lady Elizabeth de Vere, daughter of the Earl of Oxford, but this proposition came to nothing. William Herbert—he succeeded to the Earldom in 1601—was the subject in 1595 of a projected marriage with Elizabeth Carey, daughter of the second Lord Hunsdon, but the lady eventually married Sir Thomas Berkeley. In 1597 Herbert's parents were engaged in negotiations for his marriage to Lady Bridget de Vere, then thirteen years of age, the second daughter of the Earl of Oxford, and Burghley's granddaughter. The match was broken off, but why does not appear.

Both these young men engaged in amorous intrigues with the ladies of Elizabeth's court, and both suffered disgrace and imprisonment in consequence. Southampton did marry clandestinely Elizabeth Vernon in 1598, whereas Herbert declined to wed Mary Fitton in 1601, although he married in 1604 Lady Mary, the wealthy daughter of Gilbert Talbot, 7th Earl of Shrewsbury. He died in 1630.

Many writers have argued from the Stratfordian standpoint the claims of Southampton to be 'Mr. W. H.' and a number from the Baconian angle. The former of course base their contention on the dedications to 'Venus and Adonis' and to 'Lucrece'. Walter Thompson[3] finds that the New Oxford Dictionary gives a 'poem' as one of the

[1] "The Mystery of Francis Bacon" 1912.

[2] The Countess of Pembroke was Sir Philip Sidney's sister, and an accomplished lady of literary tastes.

[3] "Sonnets of Shakespeare and Southampton" 1938.

archaic meanings of the word 'passion' and thus dissipates the impression of Samuel Butler reading into the 20th sonnet a confession of moral perversity. The writer declares that by the phrase "Master-mistress of my passion" the poet is alluding to a poem he addressed to Southampton identifiable with "A Lover's Complaint", on the grounds that it was published with the Sonnets. He also suggests that most of the "Dark Woman" series came from Southampton's pen, and that Mr. W. H. is a combination of his initial and that of Shakespeare!

Bacon was fifteen years older than Southampton and they were together at Gray's Inn, where it is quite likely that the older befriended the younger man.

Dr. G. H. Rendall arguing on behalf of the Earl of Oxford as the author of the Sonnets said, "Our study of the surroundings and settings of the Sonnets yielded an ensemble entirely congruous with that in which the Earl of Southampton moved."

Sonnet 107, it can be quite well maintained refers to the death of Queen Elizabeth, the accession of James I, and to the release of Southampton from confinement in the Tower for participation in the Essex rebellion. He is no longer 'forfeit to a confin'd doom' and 'the mortal moon hath her Eclipse endur'd.' Lee agrees with these points of view; so does Dr. Rendall. Obviously the sonnet was written by someone and to someone whose fortunes and relations were directly affected by changes in affairs of State; both writer and recipient were in touch with Court circles.

Thomas Tyler refers the 'eclipse' to the Essex rebellion, and takes the 'mortal moon' to be the queen, and the word 'endur'd' to denote that the moon had passed through her eclipse and was again shining. The 'sad augurs' were those who had predicted the success of the Earl's attempt. Dr. W. S. Melsome[1] pointed out that Bacon in the History of Henry VII—"writing of another queen of the same name (as Elizabeth) one of the foundresses of Queen's College, Cambridge, says 'She has Endurd a strange eclipse.' " Margaret of Anjou, wife of Henry VI, in 1448 obtained letters patent for 'the foundation of the College'; but Elizabeth Woodville ,wife of Edward IV, aided the college as "the true foundress by right of succession."

Samuel Butler, who does not connect Southampton with the Sonnets in any way, relates no. 107 to the defeat of the Armada in 1588 and Dr. Leslie Hotson[2] sees also the Armada in the 'mortal moon.' The Spanish fleet appears to have advanced with deadly or 'mortal' intent in crescent-shaped battle formation. "Their fleet", Petruccio Ubaldino, remarked of the Spaniards, "was placed in battle araie after the maner of a moone cressante" and other writers echoed this, with their descriptions of that 'horned moone of huge and mighty shippes, which in the first appearance make a mighty moone." 1588 was a year, moreover, of almost universal apprehension. Prophecies had foretold, and astrologers confirmed that it would be a year of

[1] "The Bacon-Shakespeare Anatomy" 1945.
[2] "Shakespeare's Sonnets Dated and other Essays" 1950.

great, and perhaps of terrible, events. On these bases the sonnet can be ascribed to the end of 1588 or to 1589. Alfred Dodd considered that Bacon referred to himself as the 'mortal moon'; and the 'Eclipse' to his Impeachment. Bacon did say "the fountain of Honour is the King... To be banished from his presence is one of the greatest Eclipses of Honour that can be." Dr. Rawley says that when the moon was at her eclipse it affected Bacon strangely, even causing him to faint.

* * * *

Tyler advocates very forcibly the identification of Mr. W. H. with Pembroke. This idea was strongly supported by Hallam[1] but was refuted by Dyce[2] and also by Lee.

Thorpe surely would never have dared to designate Lord Pembroke as 'Mr. W. H. ', especially when we compare his elaborated dedications in 1609 and 1616 to the 'humbly thrice-kissed hands' of the same Lord William, Earl of Pembroke...followed by a resounding list of his distinctions. Sir Sidney Lee admits that John Aubrey (1626-1697) in his "Lives of Eminent Persons" neither in his account of Pembroke, nor in his account of Shakespeare, gives any hint that they were at any time or in any manner acquainted or associated with one another.

(to be concluded)

---

[1]*Henry Hallam* (1777-1859). "Introduction to the Literature of Europe".
[2]*Alexander Dyce* (1798-1869) in the "Life of Shakespeare" which preceded his edition of Shakespeare's works, 1864.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE EDITOR, BACONIANA

Dear Sir,

I notice in the Rev. Walter Begley's book 'Bacon's Nova Resuscitatio' (Volume 3), in which the author describes his discovery of a rare French edition of a selection of Bacon's works edited by Pierre Amboise (1631), a detail of Bacon's life which does not occur in Rawley's English edition of 'Sylva Sylvarum' but which is present in the French edition. It is interesting because the detail in question is echoed in Shakespeare's sonnet 118. It refers to the apparently harmful practice, in Bacon's opinion, of the habitual use of purgatives as a means of warding off illness. Quoting from the Rev. Begley's translation of Bacon from the French:

'In the same way the custom which has prevailed of using so many medicines has blunted the force of nature, and obliged us to resort to doctors. Our ancestors have accustomed themselves to this, and in begetting us into the world they seem to have laid the same rule upon us, so that their first mistake passes to us as a necessity To speak of myself, I have great reason to complain of this, since my bad constitution comes from no other cause. My father had such faith in the rules and precepts of Medical Art that, although he was in a perfect state of health considering his age, he never let a month pass without taking medicine. This habit so weakened his stomach that very often, through merely purging himself to guard against illness, he rather brought one on. The result was, he was obliged to pass the latter part of his life in bondage to doctors and apothecaries. It was my misfortune to be born during this latter period, and to experience from my very birth my share in my father's infirmities, which I might call my second original sin.'

Sonnet 118 also expresses this idea.

Like as to make our appetites more keen,
With eager compounds we our palate urge,
As to prevent our maladies unseen,
We sicken to shun sickness when we purge.
Even so being full of your ne'er cloying sweetness,
To bitter sauces did I frame my feeding,
And sick of welfare found a kind of meetness,
To be diseased ere that there was true needing.
Thus policy in love t'anticipate
The ills that were not, grew to faults assured.
And brought to medicine a healthful state
Which rank of goodness would by ill be cured.
But thence I learn and find the lesson true
Drugs poison him that so fell sick of you.

It would be an interesting subject of enquiry to ascertain whether this habit of purging appertained to the Earl of Leicester or to Sir Nicholas Bacon.

Yours faithfully,
HAROLD N. THOMAS,

THE EDITOR, BACONIANA.

Dear Sir,

A question for the Stratfordians to answer.

Both Baconians and Stratfordians are in agreement on one point, and that is that the author of the "Shakespeare" dramas had the most exquisite intellect the world has ever seen, He was a master of the construction of dramatic poetry and was a brilliant orator. as is self-evident from the prose passages.

If Will Shakspere was this author, how is it that there is no record that any of the eminent writers in those times ever mentioned the man Will Shakspere? The contemporaries of the author "Shakespeare" were men such as Bacon, Brooke, Beaumont, Camden, Cecil, Clarendon, Coke, Drake, Donne, Harvey, Hampden, Herbert of Cherbury, Hobbes, Hooker, Inigo Jones, Lord Pym, Selden, Vaughan, Walton and Wotton.

How is it that there is not a scrap of evidence to show that the man Will Shakspere was *personally known* to any of these brilliant men or even to any others of less note among the statesmen, scholars and soldiers of his day?

Sir Henry Wotton, whose correspondence has been preserved, mentions almost every one of note in his day with the exception of Shakspere. John Chamberlin wrote a long series of letters to his friend Dudley Carleton during the years 1598-1623, the years during which the "Shakespeare" plays were written or published. These letters are full of the news of the month from the court, the city, the pulpit and the booksellers' shops, and in them we find the court masques described in minute detail, but there is no mention of the name Shakspere.

In all Gabriel Harvey's works and his voluminous letters which have been preserved, there is not the slightest allusion to Shakspere. Surely, we might reasonably expect that some of these men would have made some reference to their great contemporary.

Why were they all silent? Why did they all *without exception* refrain from mentioning Shakspere at all?

Careful researches have been made in the works of John Selsden, Henry Vaughan, Lord Brooke, Sir John Beaumont and many other notabilities in the literary world at that time, without there being discovered even the most trivial allusion to Will Shakspere.

The fact that such a great number of literary men all avoid any mention of Shakspere is really remarkable when we consider that these same persons should have frequently referred to him: but there is no evidence that they did so.

Yours faithfully.

EDWARD D. JOHNSON.

THE EDITOR, BACONIANA

Dear Sir,

Your readers will no doubt recollect that in Bacon's *Advancement of Learning* a long example is given of the manner of working the Biliteral Cypher, a letter of Cicero's being used which occupies one page. A comparison of the relevant pages in the Latin editions of 1623 and 1624 with the page in the edition in English dated 1640 (Gilbert Wats) shows that the printing of the letter although generally similar is not in detail identical. Moreover the concealed message in Cicero's letter is in the case of the 1623 and 1640 editions printed in the biliteral characters, whereas in the 1624 edition it is printed in ordinary italics.

Henry Seymour in his pamphlet "A Cypher within a Cypher" showed that the biliteral characters of the concealed message in the 1623 edition yielded an anagram of William Shakespeare, viz:—

EPKIEAALLSRWSAEHMI

In the Gilbert Wats 1640 edition it is easy to demonstrate that the anagram is of William Shakespeare F. viz:—

EIIWPLERLASHFAAKMS

There is another interesting point. The concealed message does not use up the whole of Cicero's letter—50 letters are left over, enough for 10 more letters of message. In the 1623 edition of which only a facsimile is available to me I have had no success in getting any results. From an original of the 1640 edition, however, the extra letters, without any difficulty, yield:

LXI. YORK H. FR.

If LXI (61) was Bacon's age when the plate was prepared, the date would be 1622 (1561 + 61) and might lend colour to the suggested idea that the 1640 edition was in fact the original from which the Latin editions were prepared.

Possibly other members may have views on this.

Yours sincerely,

F. V. MATARALY

THE EDITOR, BACONIANA

Dear Sir,

THE MISSING MSS.

My letter on this subject, which you were good enough to publish in BACONIANA, No. 156 (p.46), seems to have suffered in the process of editing and printing, The words from the inscription on the monument in Stratford-on-Avon Church, as given in Dugdale's "Antiquities of Warwickshire," should read—

"death hath plac't wthin this monument Shakspeare".

The epitaph on the stone underneath which his body is buried, again according to Dugdale, should read—

"Good freind for Jesus sake forbeare
To digg the dust inclosed here
Blest be the man that spares these stones
And curst be he that moves my bones."

Yours faithfully,

T. WRIGHT

(The Editors regret that this mistake should have occurred. It is hoped in a future issue to show differences between the actual inscription and the various records of it, —including that of Sir William Dugdale, which was the earliest).

Letters to the Editor of the Daily Telegraph

HAMLET'S CROWN

Sir,

Mr. W. A. Payre will be interested to know the answer to Mr. Asquith's questioning as to why, when Hamlet's father died a natural death as everyone supposed, his brother, Claudius, succeeded to the throne instead of Hamlet. The play tells us through the mouth of Hamlet that Claudius *"popp'd in between the election and my hopes"*.

The Crown of Denmark was not hereditary. The kings of Denmark were elected by a Parliament of nobles who could choose any member of the royal line. This state of affairs lasted until Frederik III in 1660 made the Danish monarchy hereditary by a coup d'état.

In his dying speech Hamlet prophesies that the election will light on Fortinbras for the vacant throne of Denmark. The problem is how Shakespeare knew that the Crown of Denmark was elective. Perhaps one of our Shakespearian authorities can explain.

Yours faithfully,

RODERICK L. EAGLE,

Falmouth, Cornwall. 24th May, 1957

FROM SIR OTTO MUNDY

Sir,

Why did Mr. Asquith think that Hamlet was of full age? Horatio and Polonius call him "young" Hamlet, the Ghost calls him "noble youth," the King refers to his going back to school and lectures him as if he were a schoolboy.

Hamlet himself speaks and acts like a highly strung boy of 18 or so.

In the early days in this country, as in others, the King was elected; primogeniture did not become the rule until Henry III. And in his dying speech Hamlet prophesies the election of Fortinbras as king.

Yours faithfully,

OTTO MUNDY.

Oxford.